LUCAN'S »BELLUM CIVILE«

BETWEEN EPIC TRADITION AND AESTHETIC INNOVATION

EDITED BY
NICOLA HÖMKE
AND
CHRISTIANE REITZ

Beiträge zur Altertumskunde

Herausgegeben von

Michael Erler, Dorothee Gall,
Ludwig Koenen, Clemens Zintzen

Band 282

Lucan's *Bellum Civile*

Between Epic Tradition and Aesthetic Innovation

Edited by
Nicola Hömke
and
Christiane Reitz

ISBN 978-3-11-022947-9
e-ISBN 978-3-11-022948-6
ISSN 1616-0452

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

© 2010 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/New York

Druck: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Inhalt – Contents

Vorwort vii

Frederick Ahl
Quintilian and Lucan 1

Annemarie Ambühl
Lucan's 'Ilioupersis' – Narrative Patterns from the Fall of Troy in Book 2 of the *Bellum civile* 17

Lisa Sannicandro
Ut generos soceris mediae iunxere Sabinae: Die Gestalt Julias in der *Pharsalia* Lukans 39

Elaine Fantham
Caesar's Voice and Caesarian Voices 53

Alessandro Rolim de Moura
Lucan 7: Speeches at War 71

Nicola Hömke
Bit by Bit Towards Death – Lucan's Scaeva and the Aesthetisization of Dying 91

Claudia Wick
Plus quam visibilia – Lukans suggestive Nichtbeschreibungen . . . 105

Dunstan Lowe
Medusa, Antaeus, and *Caesar Libycus* 119

Erica Bexley
The Myth of the Republic: Medusa and Cato in Lucan, *Pharsalia* 9 135

Claudia Wiener
Stoische Erneuerung der epischen Tradition – Der Bürgerkrieg als Schicksal und die Entscheidungsfreiheit zum Verbrechen 155

Martin Dinter
... und es bewegt sich doch! Der Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes 175

Liste der Beitragenden – List of contributors 191

Zusammenfassungen – Abstracts 195

Literaturverzeichnis – Bibliography 203

Vorwort

Tradition und Innovation sind Konstanten antiken literarischen Schaffens. Und so beschreibt der Titel dieses Sammelbandes nicht nur das Spektrum der hier vorgestellten Beiträge und die Interessenschwerpunkte der Herausgeberinnen. Er stellt vielmehr ein Spezifikum der antiken, besonders der lateinischen Literatur in den Blickpunkt, das dem neuzeitlichen Leser den Zugang zu den Texten mitunter nicht leicht macht. Und doch ist es häufig gerade das Spiel mit der Erwartungshaltung des gebildeten Zeitgenossen, das uns den Schlüssel zur Deutung an die Hand gibt.

Niemand wird bestreiten, dass epische Dichtung von ihrem ersten uns greifbaren Auftreten in den homerischen Gedichten bis in die Spätantike – und darüber hinaus – in einer Tradition des Erzählens steht und sich aus einem Formenrepertoire bedient, das für die Produzenten abrufbar und für die Rezipienten wiedererkennbar ist. Dass Lucan in vielerlei Hinsicht ein Neuerer in dieser epischen Tradition war, hat ihn und sein Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg gerade in den letzten Jahren wieder zu einem intensiv untersuchten Forschungsgegenstand gemacht. In den folgenden Zeilen wird unsere Sicht auf das *Bellum Civile* in wenigen Worten etwas näher erläutert und von anderen Ansätzen abgegrenzt, ohne dass der Anspruch erhoben würde, hier einen umfassenden Forschungsüberblick zu liefern. Dies hat im Jahr 2005 Christine Walde in vorzüglicher Weise im Vorwort des von ihr betreuten Kongressbandes „Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert" geleistet, so wie auch das von ihr betreute Projekt eine verlässliche bibliographische Basis darstellt.[1]

Nach wie vor ist ein lebhaftes Interesse erkennbar, die historische Komponente und die Quellenbezogenheit von Lucans epischem Erzählen zu durchleuchten (so zum Beispiel im Jahr 2004 in der umfänglichen Arbeit von Jan Radicke); Frederick Ahl stellt in seinem hier vorliegenden Beitrag die Frage nach der zeitgeschichtlichen Relevanz des Bürgerkriegsepos neu, indem er nicht seinen Autor, sondern den ihn später zitierenden Leser Quintilian in den Blick nimmt. Bei der Frage nach den literarischen Quellen des Epos ist es das Verdienst von Annemarie Ambühl, in ihrem gerade erschienenen Buch „Krieg und Bürgerkrieg bei Lucan und in der griechischen Literatur" (2010) und auch in ihrem hier vorgelegten Aufsatz unseren Blick auf die enge Verflechtung lucanischer Szenengestaltung ins-

1 Walde 2005; http://www.klassphil.uni-mainz.de/Dateien/Gesamtbibliographie_alpha_(im_Aufbau).pdf

besondere mit hellenistischer Dichtung und attischer Tragödie gelenkt zu haben.

Mit weiterhin unverminderter Intensität wird die Diskussion geführt, ob sich im *Bellum civile* ein durchgängiges philosophisch-ideologisches Konzept nachweisen lässt, das den Autor in der intellektuellen Sphäre seiner Lebenszeit verortet, wie es zum Beispiel von Claudia Wiener in ihrem Buch „Stoische Doktrin in römischer Belletristik" (2006) und in ihrem Beitrag in unserem Band vertreten wird.

Obwohl der Weg zu einem Gesamtkommentar noch weit ist, wird jedenfalls die philologische Beschäftigung mit dem Text nach und nach durch zahlreiche Kommentare zu einzelnen Büchern und durch Studien zu Einzelfragen erleichtert. Dem gerade in jüngster Zeit zu beobachtenden Interesse am lange vernachlässigten neunten Buch des *Bellum civile*[2] trägt auch der vorliegende Band Rechnung: Dunstan Lowe untersucht in seinem Artikel die vielschichtige Darstellungsweise von Lucans Libyen als einem nicht nur von mythischen Monstern bevölkerten Landstrich, sondern auch als einem Ort der Konfrontation konträrer politischer Systeme. Erica Bexley analysiert, ausgehend von derselben Libyenepisode, das in der Catofigur widersprüchlich gezeichnete politische und philosophische Gedankengut und zieht daraus Rückschlüsse auf Lucans eigene Situation.

Tradition und Innovation – Lucans Umgang damit sei an einigen Beispielen kursorisch erläutert. Spezifische Formelemente prägen das antike Epos ebenso wie bestimmte kompositorische Verfahren. So ist der Katalog der Truppen ein wesentlicher Bestandteil episch-heroischen Erzählens. Im Katalog kann der Autor die lineare Abfolge, die der Rezipient des Textes notwendig nachvollzieht, durch die Anordnung in Gruppen, in Einzelfiguren, in mehr oder weniger ausführliche Benennung und Beschreibung variieren. Er ist auch ein möglicher Ort für geographische und biographische Details, und sogar Vorschattierungen künftigen Geschehens sind nicht selten; man denke nur an das Erstaunen, das die Erscheinung der Camilla am Ende des Rutulerkatalogs in Vergils *Aeneis* bei den Betrachtern hervorruft. Wenn nun in Lucans *Bellum civile* im dritten Buch (3.169ff.) die Truppen des Pompeius aufmarschieren, so wartet der Katalog mit einer solchen Fülle mythologischer Anspielungen auf, dass der Leser sich ganz überraschend in seiner Erwartungshaltung getäuscht sieht: Der bisherige Verlauf des Geschehens, unter auffälligem Verzicht auf göttliches Eingreifen und göttliche Motivation der Handlung, hätte eher eine sachlich-historische Musterung / Vorstellung der einzelnen militärischen Persönlichkeiten erwarten lassen. Stattdessen werden die Regionen, die Truppen zur Verstärkung der Militärmacht des Pompeius aussenden, mit Motiven und

2 Vgl. z.B. die Teilkommentare von Raschle 2001 und Seewald 2008 sowie den Gesamtkommentar von Wick 2004.

Einzelheiten aus dem mythisch-sakralen Bereich charakterisiert:[3] *Oete* mit seinem Epitheton *Herculea*, das Schweigen der weissagenden Eichen im chaonischen Hain (von Dodona), Kreta und seine besondere Beziehung zu Iupiter, die etymologisierende Beiziehung des Ortsnamens Encheliae (zu ἔγχελυς – Aal) zum Kadmos-Mythos, die ausführliche Parenthese zur Argofahrt anlässlich der Erwähnung von Jolkos verleihen dem eigentlich militärischen Kontext einen mythischen Hintergrund, der das Geschehen über das Historische hinaus erhebt, entzeitlicht, ja mit einer mystischen Aura umgibt. Doch zum Abschluss des Katalogs wird wiederum gegen jede Erwartung nicht, wie etwa im oben erwähnten Rutuler-Katalog Vergils, durch eine Anspielung, ein vielleicht düsteres, aber doch eben nur andeutendes Detail der Rückweg in den Gang der Handlung eingeschlagen: Stattdessen wird ganz explizit das verheerende Ende, das das Schicksal für die eben aufgestellten Truppen bereithält, festgestellt: *dignas funere Magni/exequias fortuna dedit.* In gleicher Weise wird auf das dem Leser epischer Literatur ja doch so vertraute Element des subtilen ‚foreshadowing' verzichtet, wenn das zweite Buch in der auktorialen Apostrophe mit der unverhohlenen Ankündigung von Pompeius' Untergang und Tod endet, durch das Polyptoton des Vokativs *Magne* (2,725) und des Genitivs *Magni* (2,736) als des letzten Wortes des Buches aus dem Erzählkontext markierend und rahmend herausgehoben.

Andere epische Formen wie die Ekphrasis werden eingeführt, aber in auffälliger Weise im Erzählkontext gewissermaßen wirkungslos gemacht. Die Beschreibung des sicheren Hafens von Brundisium 2,610ff. findet nur statt, um den Protagonisten von diesem letzten unbehelligten Aufenthaltsort auf italischem Boden sogleich wieder rastlos aufbrechen zu lassen. Der beschriebene Ort wird gar nicht erst zum Schauplatz. Eine andere Topothesie ist die des Hains von Massilia. Der Hain wird zwar beschrieben (3,399-425), aber er wird sogleich durch das ruchlose Abholzen als Szenerie der epischen Handlung aus dem Narrativ entfernt, er hört, kaum plastisch vor Augen gestellt, auf zu existieren. Lucans Umfunktionalisierung der Ekphrasis betrifft jedoch nicht nur deren Einbau in den Handlungsgang, sondern ihre sprachliche und stilistische Aufbereitung. Diesem Phänomen widmet sich im vorliegenden Band Claudia Wick mit ihrer Analyse des „unanschaulichen Erzählens".

Eine typische Szene des Epos ist das Rüsten des Kämpfers vor der Schlacht. Elemente einer solchen Rüstung finden sich bei Lucan in der Episode, in der wir vom Ausbruch der belagerten Einwohner von Massilia hören. Diese erreichen einen Erfolg eben nicht durch konventionelle Rüstung, sondern *non hasta viris, non letifer arcus,/telum flamma fuit*

3 Ähnlich wird der Phaethon-Mythos ausgerechnet in den sachlich-geographischen Kontext des Flüssekataloges eingeflochten (2,410).

(3,500), ebenso wie die Schiffe des Gegners ohne jeden Schmuck auskommen müssen: *non robore picto ornatas* [...] *carinas* (3,510f.). Die Schilderung der Schlacht ist ebenfalls von unkonventionellen Handlungsabläufen geprägt. Als epische Seeschlacht ohnehin ein Novum, wird im Verlauf besonders herausgestellt, dass die Schlacht weniger mit nautischer Taktik, sondern mit dem Schwert (*navali plurima bello/ensis agit* 3,569f.) oder gar mit dem Gegenelement Feuer (*pelago diversa lues – ignis* 3,681) geschlagen wird. Diese Pervertierung der Elemente findet ihre Entsprechung, wenn zu Beginn des vierten Buches das Land sich in Wasser verwandelt und das feuchte Element an unerwarteter Stelle zerstörend wirkt: *naufraga arma* heißt es in 4,87. Nach dem Ende der Schlacht werden wiederum die Bestattung und die Trauer der Hinterbliebenen benutzt, um die groteske Durchbrechung ritualisierter Konventionen zu verdeutlichen: Die Mütter und Witwen vermögen ihre Toten nicht zu erkennen, die falschen Leichen werden beweint und umarmt (3,758f.), Väter machen sich gegenseitig Leichenteile an den Scheiterhaufen abspenstig (3,760f.).

Einem ähnlichen Spiel des Autors mit der Lesererwartung unterliegen auch die *adlocutiones*: Im zweiten Buch sind drei aufmunternde und anfeuernde Ansprachen an die kämpfenden Truppen wiedergegeben, die des Domitius, des Caesar und des Pompeius (2,483ff.; 2,494ff.; 2,531). Doch ausgerechnet die pathetische und moralisch aufgeladene Rede des Pompeius läuft ins Leere; auf die *adlocutio* folgt keine Schlacht. Lucan benutzt diese dramaturgische Inkonsistenz folglich als zusätzliches Mittel, um seine Pompeius-Figur zu charakterisieren. Eine entsprechende Untersuchung des Redekontextes, der Gesprächspartner und deren unmittelbaren Reaktionen erweist sich allerdings auch für die Charakterisierung der Caesar-Figur als fruchtbar, wie Elaine Fantham in ihrem Beitrag zeigt. Anlässlich der entscheidenden Schlacht von Pharsalos treten die *adlocutiones* der beiden Feldherren, wie Alessandro Rolim de Moura in seinem Beitrag analysiert, durch das Netz gegenseitiger Verweise und Anspielungen in eine Art Dialog sowohl mit dem epischen Erzähler als auch miteinander.

Noch weitere epische Szenen unterliegen einer dramaturgischen Umdeutung oder Umkehrung. Wenn Scaevola in der Rückblende auf die Gräuel des vorigen Bürgerkrieges am Altar der Vesta gemetzelt wird (Lucan. 2,126-129), dann ist die Szene der Ermordung des Priamus in der Erzählung des Aeneas nachgebildet (*Aen.* 2,533-558); aber der Grausamkeit und so offenkundigen Frevelhaftigkeit des Geschehens zwischen Pyrrhus und Priamus stellt Lucan die trockene, rationalisierende Beobachtung gegenüber, ein so alter Mann könne nicht mehr so viel Blut verströmen; deshalb brennt das heilige Feuer trotz und angesichts des frevlerischen Mordes weiter.

Die Traumerscheinung der Julia (3,8-35) evoziert beim vorgebildeten Leser ebenfalls die Assoziation zu entsprechenden Szenen aus der griechischen und römischen Epik. Die Traum- und Geistererscheinungen in der *Aeneis* enthalten Handlungsanweisungen und haben lenkende Funktion; ohne Creusas Schattenbild und Hektors Traumerscheinung hätte Aeneas die Flucht aus der Stadt wohl nicht vollendet. Julias Worte hingegen künden das unausweichliche Übel an, und der Träumende zieht nicht die geringste Konsequenz aus dem, was er gehört hat, sondern stürzt in sein Verderben, *dei quamvis cladem manesque minentur* (3,36). Lisa Sannicandro hat sich in ihrem jüngst erschienenen Buch (2010) mit den „Frauengestalten in Lucans Pharsalia" beschäftigt und führt ihre Überlegungen hier mit einem Beitrag zur Darstellung der Julia weiter.

Auch die traditionelle epische Bauform der Aristie lässt Lucan nicht unangetastet und lenkt seinen Leser – entsprechend der im Proöm konstatierten Verkehrung von *ius* und *virtus* – bewusst in die Aporie. Im Falle des Scaeva (6,138ff.) ist damit, wie Nicola Hömke in ihrem Beitrag zeigt, nicht nur eine Verkehrung der *exemplum*-Tradition verbunden, sondern auch ein ästhetisches Darstellungsprinzip, das auf der Schilderung des künstlich ausgedehnten, mitunter zu einem stabilen Dauerzustand erhobenen menschlichen Sterbens basiert. Eine besonders schillernde Facette dieser Verwischung der Grenze zwischen Leben und Tod stellt der „Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes" dar, mit dessen literarischer Tradition und Einsatz in Lucans *Bellum civile* sich Martin Dinter in seinem Aufsatz beschäftigt.

„*Leges et foedera rerum vertit natura*": So hat Lucan (2,2f.) den Beginn des Bürgerkrieges bezeichnet. Die These von der Umkehrung der Werte wird in der Umdeutung der epischen Tradition im Erzählverlauf immer wieder belegt. Lucan ist ein in hohem Maße intertextueller Autor, und wie er die epischen Prätexte umschreibt, macht für uns einen wesentlichen Teil der Faszination des *Bellum civile* aus.

Die Rostocker Tagung im Sommer 2007, die Anlass zu dieser Publikation gab, wurde gefördert von der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität und von den Rostocker Freunden der Altertumswissenschaften e.V. Dafür bedanken wir uns herzlich. Katharina Nausch hat sich, unterstützt von Markus Kersten, mit großem Engagement um die Vorbereitung des Manuskriptes gekümmert. Auch ihnen sei hier unser Dank ausgesprochen. Dass wir am Heinrich Schliemann-Institut für Altertumswissenschaften nun schon zum wiederholten Male eine allseits als erfolgreich empfundene Tagung durchführen und zu einer Publikation reifen lassen konnten, wäre ohne den Einsatz unserer Kolleginnen und Kollegen am Institut und den Enthusiasmus unserer Studierenden nicht möglich. Allen, die damals als Gäste in Rostock vorgetragen haben, und denen, die darüber hinaus jetzt

mit ihren Beiträgen diesen Band bereichern, danken wir für ihre Mitarbeit und Geduld. Bei den Herausgeberinnen und Herausgebern der Reihe „Beiträge zur Altertumskunde“ und dem Verlag De Gruyter, besonders Sabine Vogt, bedanken wir uns für die Möglichkeit zur Publikation.

Rostock, Ostern 2010

Christiane Reitz
Nicola Hömke

Quintilian and Lucan

FREDERICK AHL

One of our legacies from the days when Classics was the educational discipline of the ruling classes is the notion that poets are (or ought to be) for, not against, 'the government.' The goal of education was to inspire the young with a yearning for patriotic combat, not to arouse them against 'the authorities.' Virgil was, and still is, accommodated to such an imperialist reading of Roman epic. His *Aeneid* is widely represented by classicists as sincerely (and properly) singing the praises of Augustus. Statius has also been accommodated to the imperialist reading, but with different results. His praise of Domitian, widely reckoned sincere, is often regarded as servile and unwarranted flattery since Domitian is not, as Augustus sometimes is, symbolic to scholars of responsible government. Lucan's outspoken attacks on the Caesars, however, did not make him a satisfactory model for training youth of the ruling class to support king and country under any circumstances. So Lucan's return to intellectual respectability signals, perhaps, an eventual end to the dominant patriotic and imperialist reading of Roman epic.[1]

Jane Wilson Joyce's intelligent new translation of the *Thebaid* suggests that Statius may be following him.[2]

1. A Model for Orators

In Domitian's reign, curiously enough, Lucan was represented by at least one writer as a model that students of rhetoric, that is to say, the future upper classes of Rome, should imitate. Quintilian comments, famously, that Lucan is a model for orators rather than for poets, *oratoribus magis*

1 There continues to be a wide range of diverse opinions about Lucan's political role and opinions. See Dewar 1988; Reitz 2006; Leigh 1997; Bartsch 1997; Boyle 1993; Masters 1992; Schrijvers 1989 and 1990. For earlier views see Henderson 1987, revised as Henderson 1998; Johnson 1987; Sullivan 1987; Ahl 1984b; Brisset 1964; Cizek 1982; Narducci 1979.

2 Joyce, Jane Wilson (ed.) (2008). *Thebaid: a Song of Thebes.* Ithaca/London.

quam poetis imitandus (10.1.90). He cannot mean that Lucan's work is too 'rhetorical' to be good poetry since he is himself writing a guide for instructors of rhetoric in their teaching and does not use 'rhetoric' and 'rhetorical' as terms of disparagement as nineteenth and twentieth century critics often did. Among Quintilian's oratorical contemporaries, poets were more likely to be disparaged than rhetoricians, as we see in Tacitus' *Dialogus* 4 where Maternus complains that Aper never stops railing at poets and forcing him to neglect his professional legal duties and come to their defence: *defendendae adversus te poeticae.*

Quintilian contends in *Instructing the Orator* 10.1.9-20 that "the orator" has supplanted the philosopher and "should be the sort of man who could really be called wise: *sit igitur orator talis qualis vere sapiens appellari possit*" (1. *prohoemium* 18). He also insists on the proximity of public poetry (Homeric Epic, Comedy, and Tragedy) to oratory (10.1.65) and its consequent usefulness in the training of orators. He admires, in particular, the eloquent free expression of Old Comedy with its penchant for going after corruption. "I doubt," he declares, "that any poetry, other than Homer's, rivals it (i.e. comedy) in being more like what orators do and in being better suited for turning people into orators: *nescio an ulla post Homerum tamen ... aut similior sit oratoribus aut ad oratores faciendos aptior.*" He also praises Euripides for approaching oratory more closely than Sophocles (10.1.68). In short, Quintilian's comment about Lucan is laudatory not damning.

As in the days when Cicero wrote the *De Oratore* and *Brutus*, the climate at Rome in Quintilian's day was becoming increasingly perilous for those whose careers required that they express political opinions in public. Maintaining a balance, under the eyes of an autocratic government, between what needed to be said in the forum or lawcourts and any desire to preserve one's professional standing, integrity, and personal survival was an art of the highest importance to Rome's educated classes. Tacitus, in fact, complains at the beginning of the *Dialogus* that his age is so bereft of praise for anyone's eloquence that it hardly keeps a grip on the very name of 'orator': *vix nomen ipsum oratoris retineat* (*Dialogus* 1). The scholars of rhetoric Tacitus represents in his *Dialogus* constitute a last generation of good orators, alive in the fictional dramatic setting of Rome in AD 73, as we see in *Dialogus* 17, but dead at the time Tacitus probably published this work, in the mid 80's AD. If Tacitus is right, there were no orators of his own day worth mentioning. But Quintilian does not share Tacitus' bleak view of the prospects for eloquence.[3] So Quintilian's designation of Lucan as a worthwhile model for orators rather than for

3 See Brink, C.O. (1989). 'Quintilian's *de causis corruptae eloquentiae* and Tacitus' *Dialogus de oratoribus*', *CQ* 39: 472-503.

poets has perhaps an ironic intertextuality with Tacitus' *Dialogus* where the principal speaker, Maternus, finally gives up his career in oratory to continue writing poetry.

Yet if Quintilian really thinks Lucan is a good model for orators, why does he mention Lucan only once and not cite a single line of Lucan's poetry, while citing six passages from Lucan's contemporary, Persius? Cicero is, unsurprisingly, the most commonly cited author in *Instructing the Orator*. Virgil runs Cicero a distant second with 150 citations, but himself outpaces Demosthenes, Homer, Horace, Aristotle, Plato, and the other writers that follow.[4] Why, then, does Quintilian approve Lucan as a model for orators, yet name him only once and never quote him? And why does he rank him last among the Roman epic poets in 10.1.90? These are some of the questions I attempt to answer in this essay as I revisit issues I first raised many years ago in a discussion of the techniques of safe criticism in Greek and Roman literature.[5]

2. Handling Domitian and Other Critics

A few years before Quintilian published his *Instructing the Orator*, Statius, in *Silvae* 2.7, a poem addressed to Lucan's widow, honouring what would have been Lucan's fiftieth birthday in AD 89, notes not only the ringing rhetorical power of Lucan's muse ('You will thunder the Pharsalian wars: *Pharsalica bella detonabis*' (2.7.66)) but the sharp political edge of his statements: "you will declare the criminal fires of a guilty master wandering among the rooftops of Remus" – *dices culminibus Remi vagantis/infandos domini nocentis ignes*" (2.7.60-61). This summary of Lucan's lost *De Incendio Urbis*, presumably about the fire of Rome in AD 64, leaves open at least two interpretations without declaring itself for either: first, that Lucan accused Nero of burning Rome; second that he wrote about the fire of Rome which Statius thinks (or people generally think) was caused by Nero.[6]

Certainly Lucan's opposition to the Caesars and his participation in the Pisonian plot to overthrow Nero recalled the tyrannicide Brutus and

4 See Odgers, Merle M. (1933). 'Quintilian's Use of Earlier Literature,' *CP* 38: 182-88; Little, Charles Edgar (1951). *Quintilian: The Schoolmaster*, 2 vols. Nashville.

5 Ahl 1984a.

6 For a fuller discussion, see my (1971) 'Lucan's *De Incendio Urbis, Epistulae ex Campania*, and Nero's Ban,' *TAPA* 102: 1-27.

Cicero of the *Philippics* a century before.[7] Quintilian, usually quick to warn against dangerous models, gives no hint, however, that he regards Lucan, an outspoken critic of the Caesars, as a potentially dangerous model for students of either poetry or rhetoric. Yet Lucan stood where bold orators should stand, but generally did not stand, in Flavian Rome: at the forefront of political battles.

Quintilian, in approving Lucan, is probably voicing an opinion not shared by the senatorial elite of his own day. Lucan's rhetoric of liberty and political activities had led to his own forced suicide, the deaths of many prominent Romans, and, arguably, the disastrous civil wars that ravaged Rome after Nero's death in AD 68. Up and coming intellectuals, such as Tacitus, voiced little sympathy with the preachers of liberty who had involved themselves in Piso's conspiracy against Nero (*Annals* 15.49). Reports of Lucan's personal cowardice when the conspiracy was discovered served to discredit both the man and his ideals. He and his fellow conspirators had, albeit unintentionally, made Rome's political situation much worse than it had been before. All hopes of achieving the freedom Lucan called for, yet feared was forever lost, were swept away. With the new imperial dynasty of the Flavians came some new and political realities.

Under Domitian, the last and most reviled of the Flavians, Tacitus and other younger aristocrats who might reasonably expect to outlive Domitian, pursued traditional public offices but deferred (most of) their writing, as senators traditionally did, until their public careers were over. They sought to secure the condemnation of the emperor in the eyes of posterity through (safe) literary silence about him rather than to condemn him in the eyes of contemporaries through (potentially dangerous) written attacks, however oblique. Yet the realities of Domitian's reign were not the same for everyone any more than those of Octavian's were for Meliboeus and Tityrus in Virgil's first *Eclogue*. Professional poets, teachers, and writers of an older generation could not afford to wait for Domitian's death and better times, thereby maintaining the literary silence aristocrats wanted. Some of these same people, though they sought and received imperial sponsorship, did not hesitate to hint that Domitian's sponsorship was not specially generous, as Statius does in his letter to Marcellus prefacing *Silvae* 4.

After his *Thebaid* appeared, Statius was pressured to justify, in letters prefacing *Silvae* 1 and 4, his publication of poems in a lower than epic style, many of which were written for Domitian and at his request. Statius' tone is defiant. He wants to show that those critics who, he has heard,

7 See Ramsey 2003 and, more generally, Vasaly 1993. Caesar's power, regardless of how generously one thinks it was wielded, was usurped. The only way to remove him from power was to kill him.

object to his writing this kind of work, have achieved nothing. Statius clearly has a particular tacit critic in mind because he shifts from plural to singular and asks that critic to state his objections publicly: *statim se profiteatur adversum!* Knowing his critic will do nothing of the sort, Statius cries, without waiting, rhetorically, for a reply: *Ita ... taceat et gaudeat!* – "So ... let him keep his precious silence and enjoy it!"

We misconstrue Flavian literature if we assume Domitian's rule was universally oppressive and that criticism of him was as 'unthinkable' as Tacitus implies. Rabbits, Martial notes, can play in the lion's mouth because they are not large enough to be his food.[8] Statements that might be dangerous if a senator made them would not necessarily harm the maker if he were a professional, provincial poet. Domitian's reign nurtured many important writers, in Greek and in Latin and marks, in some ways, the last major flowering of Latin literature under imperial sponsorship. Despite this, many scholars continue to read Statius', Martial's, or Quintilian's comments about the emperor as if they must necessarily be free of satirical bite. They read flattery the way Juvenal says Domitian read flattery.

In *Satires* 4.69-71, Domitian is taken in by a fisherman who claims that a huge fish he has landed wanted to be caught so it could honor the emperor's table:

> *Ip.se capi voluit. Quid apertius?* et tamen illi
> surgebant cristae. nihil est quod credere de se
> non possit, cum laudatur dis aequa potestas.

'The fish itself wanted to be caught.' What could be more open than this? But the emperor's coxcomb rose. "There is nothing power equal to the gods could not believe about itself when praised."

The greater an individual's power, the greater his susceptibility to flattery. Hence Juvenal's rhetorical question *quid apertius?* What could be more open? The fisherman is not speaking *palam*, "directly, forthrightly, sincerely." He is speaking *aperte*, "openly," in that his meaning, though not declared forthrightly, can be detected by anyone who looks for it: it is "figured" speech.[9] Stating something directly (*palam dicere*) and stating something openly (*aperte dicere*) are not the same. There are circumstances, Quintilian notes, when speaking directly is unsafe: *si dicere palam parum tutum est* (9.2.55). But, he adds in 9.2.67:

8 I draw here on some of my earlier articles for excerpts, particularly 1984a and 1984b.

9 See Winkler, Martin (1995). '*Alogia and emphasis* in Juvenal's Fourth Satire,' *Ramus* 24: 59-81 (also included in Boyle, Anthony James (ed.) (1995). *Roman Literature and Ideology: Ramus Essays for J.P. Sullivan.* Berwick. 227-249.

quamlibet enim apertum, quod modo et aliter intellegi possit, in illos tyrannos bene dixeris, quia periculum tantum, non etiam offensa vitatur. Quod si ambiguitate sententiae possit eludi, nemo non illi furto favet.

You can speak well and make open statement against the tyrants we were discussing, provided the statement can be understood in another way. It is only danger your are trying to avoid, not giving offense. If you can slip by through ambiguity of expression, there's no one who won't enjoy your verbal burglary.

Since Quintilian insists that rhetorical schools are not allowed to teach what cannot be used in actual rhetorical practice: *quod in foro non expedit, illic non liceat* (9.2.67), his advice indicates not only that one can speak against some textbook tyrant in the classroom, but that one can find a way to do the same publicly.

Juvenal's fisherman can use flattery to turn a potentially dangerous situation to his own advantage because Domitian's high opinion of himself leads him to mistake flattery for truth. The more flattering a view we take of ourselves, the greater what Plutarch calls our self-love, *philautia*, in his discussion in *Moralia* 48F-49A, the more easily a flatterer can move us as he wishes. Domitian's credulity makes him look silly to anyone who knows that fish do not wish to be caught. Once the emperor has accepted the flattering falsehood as truth, however, his courtiers, not the flatterer, are menaced by the truth. They look more ridiculous than the emperor because they accept as true what they know to be false but can challenge only by directly (*palam*) denouncing the fisherman who has spoken *aperte*. The flattering fisherman is protected by imperial vanity and courtly servility.

3. The Uncompromising Poet-Critic

Anyone who does not detect a person who is *aperte ... adulantem*, and assumes the flattery of himself is sincere, looks stupid in the eyes of others as Cicero suggests in *De Amicitia* 99:

Aperte enim adulantem nemo non videt, nisiqui admodum est excors; callidus ille et occultus ne se insinuet, studiose cavendum est |...| quid autem turpius est illudi?

There is no one who does not see open adulation, except for a person entirely out of touch with reality. So one must take very studious care that this shrewd and hidden flatterer does not snake his way into us. For what is more disgraceful than to be mocked?

Yielding to flattery is yielding to mockery and Cicero is concerned about how to distinguish a real friend from a flatterer. Seneca observes cynically of the flatterer (*Natural Questions* 4a, preface 9):

> quo apertior est adulatio, quo improbior, quo magis frontem suam perfricuit, cecidit alienam, hoc citius expugnat.
>
> The more open flattery is, the more outrageous, the straighter it keeps its own face while leaving others crestfallen and shocked, the more quickly it takes its victim by storm.

Flattery was considered by the ancients not simply the art of the deceiver, but a form of aggression. The line between sincerity and insincerity is so slight that Plutarch distinguishes friend from flatterer by observing that a flatterer says: "speak your mind" whereas a friend says: "I'll do it if I can and if it's possible" (*Moralia* 62E).[10]

Lucan's bluntness about political issues is exceptional among Latin epicists and widely acknowledged as such by modern scholars. It also explains why there is more agreement about Lucan's political views than about Virgil's, since a) many scholars read all Latin poetic texts as if they were written *palam*; and since b) Lucan usually expresses political views *palam* rather than *aperte*. His preface to Nero, the source for the sharpest divergences in scholarly interpretation of his political ideas, is the only place where what is probably now a majority of scholars allow that he is probably writing *aperte*.

Other epicists, such as Virgil and Ovid, who write almost entirely *aperte*, are routinely read as if they were writing *palam*. Even if one writes *aperte*, however, caution is needed. Figured usages should not be obvious (*ne sint manifestae!*), Quintilian warns, or too frequent (9.2.69-70); if one packs them in, it is the figured speech, not the thought, that will lie open, *apertum*, and exposed: *densitate ipsa figurae aperiuntur*, (9.2.72). Once the art is detected, the effect is lost, and the writer may be in as much danger as he would have been if he had spoken forthrightly. This, I suspect, is the trap into which Ovid fell.[11] Statius is surely writing *aperte* when he observes at the opening of his *Thebaid* that all his powers can describe, as yet, is the total destruction of morality in the contest over an impoverished realm, mythic Thebes; he is not yet ready to sing of Domitian, or of a civil war that would bring the wealth of the whole world under the rule of a single individual. That task must be held for later.

10 These phrases come from adjacent lines spoken by the same person in three different Homeric locations: *Odyssey* 5.89; 5.90; *Iliad* 14.195 and 196; *Iliad* 18.426 and 427. In each case a god is speaking to a god; and the flattering remark precedes the 'friendly' remark.

11 See my discussion in (1985) *Metaformations: Wordplay and Soundplay in Ovid and Other Classical Poets*. Ithaca/London. 64-99.

In summarizing the use of figured speech in direct attacks on tyrants, Quintilian refers to it as *silentium*, "silence", an appropriate term for speech in which what is meant is not said, but left for the listener to discover. Strangely, the real business of the law courts, what Quintilian calls *vera negotia*, as opposed to deliberate rhetorical attacks on tyranny, has not yet experienced "this need for silence" – *hanc silenti necessitatem* (9.2.68), even though Quintilian feels that the man engaged in such business is in considerable danger. In the courts, one may indeed have to censure *personae potentes* – "powerful personages" (*ibid.*) to make one's case, to attack the powerful even if this is not one's direct or desired goal. Yet free expression in the lawcourts has not been silenced in quite the way it has when one is directly 'addressing' the tyrant. And that, perhaps, is why Quintilian thinks Lucan's forthrightness is a good model for the aspiring orator in his (and Domitian's) Rome.

The death of Nero and the change of dynasties from Julio-Claudian to Flavian creates a false sense of separation between Lucan and his epic successors who were, like Quintilian himself, within a few years of Lucan's age or, in the case of Silius Italicus, older than Lucan. So Quintilian's hint that Rome needs politicians like Lucan more than it needs poets like him is rather interesting. There was, in Quintilian's lifetime, an extraordinary production of good epic from Valerius, whom Quintilian mentions, and from Statius and Silius Italicus whom he does not name, since his policy is not to name poets still alive as he is writing. Of these three poets, only Silius ventures directly negative comments about the Rome of his own day; and his comments are expressions of disgust rather than cries for revolution. Only Statius' incomplete *Achilleid* dates to the last years of Domitian's reign, when the senatorial class, at least, was beginning to wonder what would happen to the empire when Domitian died.

Poets, of course, cannot effect the kind of uprising Lucan envisages in his epic unless they are associated with those who have substantial political and military resources at their disposal. Such revolutionary energy was missing from senatorial circles by the end of Domitian's reign in AD 96. Another *Pharsalia* would not give the call more force. But reading Lucan might inspire young aristocrats as they entered public life to undertake the quest for liberty. We tend to underrate the intensity of Lucan's feeling that freedom is forever lost. Ralph Johnson faults Lucan for an obsession with what he calls the 'momentary monsters' of his world, and for failing to grasp that human power and decadence are essentially cloud-like and unenduring.[12] In terms of cosmic time or even the experience of the twentieth century, Johnson is right. Many of our monsters have been short-lived and thus, from a deterministic perspective, 'doomed' from the

12 Johnson 1987: vi (citing Alexander Pope).

outset. In larger historical perspectives, even such freedom as the Roman Republic offered was gone for a millennium and a half. Lucan had every reason to think (or fear) that it was gone forever. "We are cast down," Lucan laments, "until the end of time" – *in totum mundi prosternimur aevum* (7.640).

Lucan's epic has remained a permanent, but almost solitary, poetic call to battle for liberty against Caesarism and its successors, a call that can only work when its passion is able to re-energize the opposition to tyranny. Many have subsequently contended that Rome's loss of 'liberty' was not a real loss since the old Republic was (as Lucan concedes) wholly corrupt and ruined. Romans should, therefore, have reconciled themselves to the Julio-Claudians. Ancient writers who resisted the Caesars were, at best, sentimentalists, opponents of progress and common sense, who wanted 'to turn the clock backward', to reject, that is, historical inevitability.[13]

Attacks on Lucan's *libertas* recall those on inefficient democracy in the political debates of the nineteen twenties and thirties. Mussolini described democracy as "merely a verbal illusion for simple-minded folk", and Winston Churchill, for a while an admirer of Mussolini, declared that democracy had "invaded the Council Chamber" and "liquidated the prestige of the House of Commons."[14] Churchill felt happier with the oligarchic nineteenth century Parliament, and commented: "The vote given to every one has been regarded as a trifle by many, and as a nuisance by many more."[15] Rostovtzeff felt the same disquiet. "Is not every civilization bound to decay as soon as it begins to penetrate the masses?" he asked.[16] Such writers did not argue, as does Lucan's Caesar, in a speech addressed to his mutinous troops, that the human race lives for the benefit of a few: *humanum paucis vivit genus* (5.343), one of Caesar's many raw statements of distasteful reality in Lucan. Rather they contended, as Plato's Thrasymachus does, that the ruler, however much he appears to act in his own interests, even unjustly, makes life better for the ruled.

Although Lucan's epic was not approved for school reading during the nineteenth and most of the twentieth centuries, there is a widespread, though obliquely expressed, awareness of it among politicians during the rise of fascism as an ideological challenge to the supporters of dictator-

13 MacMullen, Ramsay (1966). *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire*. Cambridge, Mass. 33.

14 Forst de Battaglia, Otto (ed.) (1930). *Dictatorship on its Trial*, trans. Huntley Paterson with an Introduction by Winston S. Churchill. London. 9-10.

15 *Ibid.*

16 Rostovtzeff, Michael Ivanovitch (1957). *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, (second edition), revised by P.M. Frazer, 2 vols. Oxford.

ship. De Battaglia observes: "dictatorship resembles high treason – a crime from which at first it is barely distinguishable – in that if it fails it constitutes a felony which is severely punished, while its success is hailed as a highly patriotic and praiseworthy achievement." The statement is little more than an elaboration of Lucan's *ius datum sceleri* and of the notion expressed by his Caesar that victory and defeat are the measures of innocence and guilt.[17] Hence Lucan's famous declaration of the opposition between freedom and the absolutist state: *par quod semper habemus,/libertas et Caesar, erit* (7.695-96) – "we have the matched conflict we always have between liberty and Caesar."[18] Lucan had glimpsed, if not explored, the idea that the apparent good of the body politic may conflict with that of the individual regardless of the system of government. But his voice of resistance to autocracy is readily identifiable with that of the individual in its battle with the state.

The glamour of success and power, de Battaglia argues, "makes the triumphant ideology accepted as their own by the vast majority. A victorious cause is pleasing not only to the gods, but also to the masses, and a difficulty overcome is approved by the Catos."[19] The Lucanian subtext is now explicit: *victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni* (Lucan. 1.128) – "the victorious cause pleased the gods but the conquered cause pleased Cato." Lucan's Cato, however, is not reconciled to the idea that success is the measure of virtue.

Such scholars as Ronald Syme, who condemn the principate as usurpation and tyranny and find a resemblance between Octavian and Hitler, agree with Lucan that the *Pax Augusta* was purchased at the cost of tyranny: *cum domino pax ista venit* (1.670). Yet Syme concludes that, after a century of anarchy, twenty years of civil war and military tyranny "if despotism was the price, it was not too high."[20] "To a patriotic Roman of Republican sentiments," Syme continues, paraphrasing Favonius' comment to Cato in Plutarch (*Brutus* 12), "even submission to absolute rule was a lesser evil than war between citizens." De Battaglia would concur. But not Lucan. And apparently not Quintilian either.

---

17 De Battaglia 1930. 287-88.

18 De Battaglia echoes this contention too (*ibid.* 372): "To sum up: if we come to the conclusion that dictatorships have meant a positive gain for the countries in which they have been established, it must be borne in mind that we have hitherto considered the matter only from the standpoint of the interests of the State, the primary need of which is to be governed and to secure internal unity without overmuch regard for the individual. But if we turn to the citizen of the State for his opinion, we find that the trial of dictatorship is merely an episode in the everlasting dispute *individuum versus societatem* [...]"

19 *Ibid.* 374.

20 Syme, Ronald (1939). *The Roman Revolution.* Oxford. 2.

The art of public speaking, as Quintilian presents it, goes hand in hand with the rhetoric of poetry; and imitation of good models in various literary genres, a topic to which Quintilian devotes the second chapter of book 10, is an essential element in the training of the orator. Although he encourages orators to read poetry, Quintilian warns that orators must not follow all figured usages poets deploy, but only those that are, in some practical way, useful. Orators, he notes, have to work in a world of harsh realities rather than of poetic fantasies: "We orators are standing in the battle line, fighting for the highest stakes, striving for victory [...] I wouldn't want weapons that are rusty with disuse, but those that have a terrifying gleam [...] like that of steel [...] not the gleam of gold and silver, which is useless in war and dangerous to its possessor" (10.1.30). Under such circumstances, Lucan's historical epic might fill Quintilian's prescription better than the *Aeneid* or the *Metamorphoses*. Elsewhere in his literary discussion Quintilian expresses the engagement of poetry with politics in his treatment of Greek not of Roman poets. Nothing in his treatment of Roman literature, even of Cicero, compares with his discussions of the rhetorical impact Greek Comedy (Old and New) and of the contrasts among Greek tragedians as oratorical presences. It is as if Quintilian worries that the act of elucidating the political innuendoes in a text might suddenly expose to danger those writers who had used that text in their own speeches or writing. In Roman writers, then, Quintilian focuses on style rather than political tone. His only exception is Lucan.

4. The Parade of Writers

It is, I think, significant that Quintilian holds his survey of Roman literature back until the tenth of his twelve books.[21] By then he has explained, among other things, how the orator must learn the arts of suggestion, innuendo, double-entendre, and, more generally, how he can pursue a public career and survive in the paranoid environment of contemporary Rome. Quintilian has conveyed necessary skills and advice to be imparted to students without unduly compromising his own integrity and his own life, the lives of others, or the continued accessibility of great works of Latin literature. He has also taught us how to read his own prose. Quintilian is as adept at crafting complex figured usages for his own didactic purposes as he is at noting their presence and analyzing them in the works of others.

Ancient epic is full of lists and catalogues. So Quintilian's presentation of Roman literature to his fellow Romans much as Virgil's ghost of

21 For such lists of writers see Rutherford, Ian C. (1998). *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age*. Oxford. 39-53.

Anchises parades the personages of the Roman republic's last century to Aeneas has a special literary aptness, given its oblique references, ambiguities, and puzzling omissions.[22] Arranging catalogues ambiguously is an art in which Virgil is unsurpassed. In *Aeneid* 6.760-846, Anchises gives a censored account of the souls of Aeneas' descendants streaming towards the River Lethe to be reincarnated. It can be seen as falling into two sections: the age of kings 760-817; and 818-846: the republic. In this reading, Octavian (Caesar Augustus) is the central figure in the age of kings; and the father-in-law and son-in-law, the unnamed Julius Caesar and Pompey, are the central figures in the wars marking the demise of the republic. But, reading it another way, Octavian is juxtaposed to Rome's founder Romulus and to Cybele.

Anchises blurs the line between monarchy and republic: when Lucius Brutus expels the last king Tarquinius Superbus ('Tarquin the Proud'), Anchises talks of avenging Brutus' "proud soul": *animamque superbam/ultoris Bruti* (6.817-18). And line 846, which marks the end of the republican parade, and is a slightly modified citation from Ennius, hails Fabius Maximus as "you, the one man who, by slowing things down, restored our republic" – *unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem.* This line also resonates oddly with Octavian's boast in bronze all over the empire: "I restored the republic" – *restitui rem publicam.* Virgil allows several simultaneous readings of his catalogue here and does not force the reader to privilege any. One can quote safely (and with approval) from many parts of the *Aeneid* under even the most oppressive regimes whether one is in the company of the tyrant or of the tyrant's enemies.

Quintilian takes a leaf from Virgil's book in his review of Latin literature. He passes over much in silence or with summary and minimal comment. In 10.1.96, for example, he declares that Horace is the only Roman lyric poet worth naming. The recently deceased Caesius Bassus could be included, he says, grudgingly, "were you to feel you should add someone" – *si quem adicere velis*; but there are talented poets among the living who far surpass Bassus: *sed eum longe praecedunt ingenia viventium.*[23] He does not, however, specify who these talented individuals are. In talking of historians, he mentions at 10.1.104 someone worth remembering through time immemorial, *vir saeculorum memoria dignus.* "It is now understood who he is", he continues, "but some day he will be named" – *qui olim nominabitur, nunc intellegitur.* Quintilian will no more name a living writer than Juvenal will criticize a living criminal or than Martial

22 See my discussion in (2007). *Virgil: Aeneid.* Oxford. esp. 373-82.

23 Russell, Donald (2001). *Quintilian: The Orator's Education.* Cambridge, Mass. IV. 305 n. 127 speculates that Quintilian is alluding to Statius, but there is no means of knowing for sure.

and Statius will name one another.[24] Instead of names we find a protective shield of silence, the *silentium* that we do not need, he has assured us, in the law courts. At the same time, he is, of course, putting us on notice that if we cannot read his silence we will not understand the full implications of the text. He is writing *aperte*.

There is a wistfulness about the vague and remote futurity implicit in Quintilian's *olim*, which, in earlier literature, is more commonly used of a distant or mythic past: "once upon a time." And only a single letter separates the future *nominabitur* from an imperfect *nominabatur*. The historian's present nameless reality in Quintilian contrasts with Pompey's reality in Lucan as the ghost of a name or the days when "the whole Latin name (league) will be a folk-tale" – *tunc omne Latinum fabula nomen erit*. In the latter instance, Lucan makes explicit what is implicit in Anchises' observation about the Latin cities in *Aeneid* 6.773-76. These Latin cities, which are yet to be founded in Aeneas' day, are dead in Virgil's day: "they will exist in the future as names (and that is all they will be), now they're lands that are nameless" – *haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae* (*Aeneid* 6.776). Aeneas would surely miss Anchises' point. Virgil's contemporaries could fill in the information omitted. Nowadays readers fall somewhere in between, as they do in deciding who the superb historian Quintilian mentions might be.

Quintilian gives his instruction with artful obliquity and leaves much for readers to infer. The task of inference is hard, since the purpose of such authorial 'silence' is precisely to make it difficult to demonstrate who or what is being referred to. Anything readers are left to adduce for themselves can obviously be disputed. Besides, we ourselves, two millennia distant, are not the readership Quintilian had in mind. We cannot always remedy his silence with our voices and know what names to adduce where. At least, though, we must acknowledge that Quintilian's text is incomplete without the reader's interaction.

5. Domitian's Poetic Standing

In 10.1.90, Quintilian lists Roman epic poets, in descending order, from most to least approved. He says Virgil is the best, but never tells us why. He even undercuts this assessment slightly by alluding to Domitius Afer's witticism that Virgil ranks closer to first than to third (10.1.86). Similarly, he notes: "we have lost much in Valerius", but adds no further explanation. Following Virgil, and at a great distance, Quintilian insists, are Macer and Lucretius. Lucan occupies last place in the rankings: at the bottom of the

24 Juvenal, *Satires* 1.155-57.

list of epicists, albeit a short and very exclusive list. Yet Lucan's is not the last name on the list. It is followed, in a curious praeterition, by a name Quintilian says is the greatest of all in poetic potential, though precluded from formal ranking because its possessor has other cares and preoccupations: the Emperor Domitian. Domitian, not Lucan, is last on Quintilian's list of Latin epic poets. He is with the epicists but not of them, juxtaposed not to Virgil at the beginning, even though Virgil is marked as by far the best, but placed after Lucan at the end. Domitian, then, is last, but not ranked last, since he appears not to have had any substantial body of work to be ranked on. It is the same kind of puzzle we face with Anchises' placement of Augustus next to Romulus: is it to honour him as second founder of Rome, to put him in the middle of a catalogue of kings, or both?

Quintilian names only five poets, including Lucan, who had been his contemporaries yet cites only one of them, the satirist Persius, a total of six times.[25] Of the five, three in addition to Lucan are dead as Quintilian writes: the lyric poet Caesius Bassus (whose works do not survive); Persius; and Valerius Flaccus, author of the *Argonautica*. The only still living contemporary poet Quintilian names is the emperor Domitian, just as the only still living Roman of Virgil's day that Anchises' ghost names in *Aeneid* 6 is Augustus. It is surely significant that the only living Flavian writer named is the one whose existence makes it impossible to name any of the others without imperilling them.

Of Domitian's early interest in poetry Suetonius *Dom.* 2.2 observes:

> simulavit et ipse mire modestiam in primisque poeticae studium, tam insuetum antea sibi quam postea spretum et abiectum, recitavitque etiam publice
>
> He himself also put on quite an amazing show of modesty and above all an enthusiasm for poetry – something as far removed from his regular routine before as it was scorned and rejected by him later. He even gave public performances.

In *Dom.* 20 Suetonius adds:

> numquam tamen aut historiae carminibusque noscendis operam ullam aut stilo vel necessario dedit. praeter commentarios et acta Tiberii Caesaris nihil lectitabat; epistolas orationesque et edicta alieno formabat ingenio

25 I omit Seneca the Younger because he belongs to an older generation, and because Quintilian treats him separately (10.1.125) and never makes it clear whether he is referring to Seneca the Elder or Seneca the Younger. See also Ahl, Frederick (2008). *Two Faces of Oedipus*. Ithaca/London. 11-16; 126-32.

> He never put any effort either into learning history or poetry or developing even the rudiments of style. He didn't do any reading regularly, aside from the commentaries and diaries of the Emperor Tiberius; and he relied the intellects of others to generate his letters, orations, and edicts.

Quintilian's ranking of Latin epicists can be read as a credible scholarly assessment until we reach the praise of Domitian's unfulfilled poetic genius. At that point suspicions arise about the juxtaposition of a contemporary Caesar whose public life left him no time for poetry with Lucan, an epicist who took time from writing poetry to participate in public life (or vice versa), who is a better model for imitation by men in public life than by poets, and who used his skills at poetry and political rhetoric to plot against and assail verbally Caesars and Caesarism.

Quintilian's reference to Lucan is a fine example of his skill as a master-teacher. The poet of liberty and the Caesar are matched together, though Domitian is now the poet and Lucan the model for the public speaker. You can take Lucan and put him face to face with Domitian as he once faced Nero. And you have not just told but shown your students that Lucan can be recommended, in a published book, as an oratorical model at a time when names are treated as highly fragile. But if you actually cite his most famous lines, you could be in trouble. The poets, particularly Silius Italicus, were already, as Quintilian surely knew, following as best they could in Lucan's steps. But liberty had to keep its way open to the forum and the law-courts for new generations, if tyranny was not to choke what little freedom was left. And Lucan's epic had the energy to keep the dream alive in the orator's mind.

Lucan's 'Ilioupersis' – Narrative Patterns from the Fall of Troy in Book 2 of the *Bellum civile*

ANNEMARIE AMBÜHL

1. Introduction: The Old Man's Recollections of the Civil War Between Marius and Sulla (Lucan. 2.67-233) and the Ilioupersis Tradition

The beginning of book 2 of Lucan's *Bellum civile* sketches a somber picture of Rome at a crucial turning-point between the past and the future, as the people despair at the impending outbreak of civil war between Caesar and Pompey.[1] After the collective of the women and the younger men who will soon have to choose sides in the civil war (16-64), an anonymous male figure of the older generation is singled out as the third and most important speaker; his narrative is the longest direct speech in the *Bellum civile* (67-233).[2] This old man's recollections of the earlier civil war between Marius and Sulla forty years ago have often been adduced as a typical example of Lucan's 'rhetoric of dismemberment' with its gruesome descriptions of horrific massacres, surrealistic wounds and heaps of corpses.[3] While Elaine Fantham's commentary offers a wealth of literary parallels,[4] the passage has also been subjected to a structural and stylis-

1 This is the expanded version of a paper presented at the Rostock conference and later at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. I would like to thank the organizers and the audiences at both occasions for their helpful comments. In a forthcoming monograph on Lucan's reception of Greek poetry and especially Attic tragedy, which originates in the Basel Lucan project directed by Prof. Dr. Christine Walde (now University of Mainz), I will treat the Trojan themes I study here with regard to Lucan. 2 in the context of the whole work and especially in connection with Caesar's visit to the ruins of Troy in Lucan. 9.

2 Tasler 1972: 235-247; Schmitt 1995: 10; 41-79.

3 The quote derives from the title of Most 1992, who however does not discuss the present passage in detail; neither does Fuhrmann 1968 in his study of disgusting and gruesome descriptions in Latin poetry. On the pervasive theme of dismemberment in the *Bellum civile* see now Dinter 2005; 2006 and the essays by Dinter and Hömke in this volume.

4 Fantham 1992. See also the commentaries by van Campen 1991 and Dreyling 1999 (mainly historical and stylistic).

tic analysis by Gian Biagio Conte, who identifies the absurd, the pathetic and the hyperbolical as defining characteristics of Lucan's anticlassical aesthetics; in his view, these find their expression in an excess of visualization which breaks down the barriers between form and content and which he describes as an essentially dramatic technique within the epic form.[5] In contrast to Conte's study, in my own reading of the passage I focus less on style and rhetoric but more on narratology and intertextuality. Nor shall I in this context apply a psychological approach, although the speech of the old man can also be read as a literary reflection on the workings of memory and the transfer of traumatic experiences from one generation to the next.[6]

The subject matter of the old man's recollections of the times of Marius and Sulla can be traced down to the historiographical and rhetorical tradition of civil-war exempla.[7] However, the relatively free chronological order in which Lucan combines these elements into a carefully structured character-speech testifies to his reworking of the historical material by employing devices deriving from the poetic tradition.[8] Among such poetic models, the Iliou persis, the mythological tale of the fall of Troy, has been identified as a prime subtext informing Lucan's narrative, in its manifestations in Greek epic and tragedy as well as in its reworkings in Latin poetry, especially in the second book of Virgil's *Aeneid*.[9]

The function of these parallels has often been explained through an ideological reading, in the sense that civil-war Rome is being portrayed as a second Troy destined to fall again, in pointed contrast to Virgil's optimistic prophecy of a future Rome rising from the ashes of Troy.[10] Yet

5 Conte 1968.

6 The interpretation of the passage by Schrijvers 1988 focuses on the Roman people's traumatic memories and their fear of recurrence of men-made disasters; a similar approach is found in Walker 1996: 80-83 and Gowing 2005: esp. 85f.

7 On Sallust, Livy, Valerius Maximus and the declamations as Lucan's possible sources see Fantham 1992: 91. Jal 1961 discusses instances of cruelty committed during various civil wars in the Roman tradition.

8 Conte 1968, Fantham 1992: 19-34, 90-121 and Schmitt 1995: 41-79 point out the interaction of historical and poetic models, whereas Radicke 2004: 203-207 apart from a passing reference to Virgil *Aen.* 2 takes only the historical tradition into account. Brena 1993 and Narducci 2000; 2002: 122-125 study Lucan's technique of blending various literary models in the passage on Scaevola (2.126-129; see below §4), which also happens to be one of the instances of chronological manipulation in the speech.

9 E.g. Fantham 1992: 8f., 28, 84f. *ad* 30-36, 96 *ad* 85-86, and *pas.sim* in the commentary on the speech.

10 See e.g. Narducci 1973 and 1979: 49-54, reworked in Narducci 2002: 75-87, 111-126. Seng's 2003 especially biased ideological reading of the function of Troy

apart from the issue whether such an interpretation gives the full picture of Lucan's vision of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, I propose to look at the correspondences between Lucan's narrative and the Ilioupersis in a different way. After reviewing the Ilioupersis theme in Greek and Latin poetry and especially in the Neronian context, I study the poetic tradition on the fall of Troy from an aesthetic perspective as a background for Lucan's depiction of horrors. Then, from a narratological point of view, I explore how Lucan makes use of narrative patterns from various genres in order to transform his historical subject matter into an epic narrative. His choice of integrating a flashback by means of a first-person narrative in the mouth of a character continues a well-established epic technique, for which Aeneas' recollections of the fall of Troy in *Aeneid* 2 serve as the obvious example. However, it will prove profitable to look beyond this model for further possible precedents in the tragic tradition. My aim is not so much to identify specific verbal allusions (a rather futile task anyway considering the many Greek and Latin texts that have been lost), but rather to study the adaptation and transformation of motifs and narrative techniques and to add some facets to the intertextual background of Lucan's characters. As we will see, the reception of the Ilioupersis in the *Bellum civile* has mainly been mediated through Lucan's Roman predecessors – Virgil, Ovid and the tragedies of his uncle Seneca –, but in some cases at least, direct reception of the Greek texts seems likely.

2. Why the Ilioupersis?

Lucan's reworking of the Ilioupersis can be set in a broader literary and cultural context. In literary terms, the Ilioupersis has always been a prime intertextual *locus*.[11] Already Homer's *Iliad* includes glimpses of the fall of Troy in the form of prolepses that allude to other parts of the oral tradition beyond the scope of the epic.[12] The theme is further explored in the epic cycle (*Little Iliad* and *Ilioupersis*) and in lyric poetry (Stesichorus' *Ilioupersis*). Attic tragedy engages with the epic tradition in a complex way,

in the *Bellum civile* does not include book 2. Trojan themes are developped further in the rest of book 2 and beyond (see Rossi 2000: esp. 574f.).

11 Anderson 1997 gives a comprehensive overview of the Ilioupersis tradition in early Greek poetry and art, including Attic tragedy; Pallantza 2005 studies the treatment of the Trojan War in general in the literature of the same period. See also Fantham 1982: 50-75 on the literary background of Seneca's *Troades*.

12 These prolepses are mainly put in the mouth of Trojan characters: Priam envisages his own mutilated body lying in the doorway and eaten by his dogs (22.59-71) and Andromache anticipates Astyanax' terrible fate in her lament over Hector's corpse (24.729-738). See Anderson 1997: 28-38, 53-59 on the complex interaction of these passages with other versions of the Ilioupersis.

as is evident especially in Euripides' aftermath plays (*Troades, Hecuba, Andromache*) that view the fall of Troy from the perspective of its female victims.[13] Hellenistic poetry tends to avoid the 'big' theme, only to let it slip in through the back door again in smaller or innovative genres such as epigrams or the messenger-speech relating Cassandra's prophecy of the sack of Troy and its consequences in Lycophron's *Alexandra*.[14]

For the Romans, the Ilioupersis of course assumes an additional significance, as the fall of Troy for all its tragic implications forms the necessary precondition for the rise of Rome. Here is not the place to review the fate of the myth of Troy in Latin literature.[15] Among the many representations and transformations of Trojan themes, the fall of Troy is reflected in archaic epic and tragedy, Catullus, Vergil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, to name only the most prominent examples. In Neronian literature, the myth of Troy found an even broader resonance than in the times of Augustus.[16] Almost every writer of the period seems to have devoted himself to the theme, beginning with the emperor Nero, whose *Troica* apparently exhibited a decidedly pro-Trojan tendency (fr. 9-10 Blänsdorf/7-8 Courtney; cf. *Carmina Einsidlensia* 1.38-41); the notorious *Halosis Ilii* he is said to have recited during the fire of Rome in 64 A.D. may well have been a part of this epic.[17] Two of Seneca's tragedies treat the fall of Troy (*Troades, Agamemnon*),[18] and of course Lucan himself composed an *Iliaca* as a youth work; its scope is unknown, but it possibly did not go beyond the end of the *Iliad* and thus did not include the fall of Troy (fr. 5-6a Blänsdorf/5-6 Courtney; cf. Statius *silv.* 2.7.55f.).[19]

Among the literary experiments of the Neronian period such as the miniature version of the *Iliad* in the *Ilias Latina* or the fictitious eyewitness account ascribed to Dictys of Crete (*Ephemeris belli Troiani*), an especially intriguing case is the *Troiae Halosis* in Petronius' *Satyricon* (89), a iambic reworking of Aeneas' tale of the Trojan Horse from *Aeneid*

13 See Ambühl (forthcoming).

14 On the theme of the fall of Troy in Hellenistic epigrams see Harder 2007: esp. 419-422 and in Hellenistic poetry in general the recent study by Sistakou 2008.

15 See Erskine 2001 for an overview of the fate of Troy and the Trojan myth in antiquity, especially in Rome; a recent brief sketch on Troy in Latin literature is found in Putnam 2007.

16 For the following see Néraudau 1985; cf. also Fabre-Serris 1998: 149-168.

17 Blänsdorf 1995: 326-331; Courtney 2003: 357-359; see also Schubert 1998: 97-100. The ancient tradition on Nero's recitation during the fire starts with Tacitus (*ann.* 15.39.3) and Suetonius (*Nero* 38.2); cf. Cassius Dio 62.18.1.

18 The *communis opinio* assignes the *Troades* to the middle group of Seneca's tragedies and thus very probably to the Neronian period; on the problem of dating see now Reitz 2006: 53f.

19 Blänsdorf 1995: 319-324; Courtney 2003: 352-354.

2 put in the mouth of the poet Eumolpus. Along with its companion piece, the *Bellum civile* (119-124), it reads like a commentary on the favourite themes of Neronian literature, in whatever way the relationship of the two poems to the works of Seneca and Lucan should be defined (in my view as a sophisticated parody rather than as serious literary criticism in the sense of a polemical attack);[20] together they might perhaps even be considered as a token of Petronius' recognition of Lucan's reworking of the Virgilian Ilioupersis.[21]

The predilection for Trojan themes and the sympathy for the Trojan side featured in many of these productions stand in a certain tension to Neronian philhellenism, but the common denominator may be identified in a renewed interest for Greek literature, marking yet another phase of its adaptation and transformation into *Romana carmina* (cf. Lucan. 1.66). In contrast to the explicit reworkings of the Trojan myth in Neronian literature, in the *Bellum civile* Lucan employs the Ilioupersis in an indirect manner as an implicit background for his civil-war narrative. This strategy fits in with his hyperbolical stance towards all preceding literature. Just as 'his' civil war exceeds any civil war (Lucan. 1.1: *bella* |...| *plus quam civilia*), so his epic supersedes the epic tradition by allusively including descriptions of war in various genres of Greek and Latin literature, through what might be termed 'generic enrichment' rather than the outworn 'crossing of genres.'[22]

Lucan's civil-war Rome thus parallels not only Thebes, the obvious mythological paradigm of fraternal war,[23] but also fallen Troy, a strategy visible partly already in the *Aeneid* (see below §4 on Priam and Pompey). Indeed, beyond the strictly literary dimensions of the Ilioupersis and its development into a rhetorical *topos* employed by poets and historians, the fall of Troy has often served as a paradigm for the fate of historical

20 See the balanced discussion in Connors 1998: 84-146 with a review of different interpretations.

21 In both cases, Eumolpus breaks off at the point where Lucan's epic narrative just gets started; his *Troiae Halosis* does not represent the prominent episodes of individual killings during the sack of the city.

22 Harrison's 2007 term, who defines generic enrichment in Augustan poetry as "the way in which generically identifiable texts gain literary depth and texture from detailed confrontation with, and consequent inclusion of elements from, texts which appear to belong to other literary genres" (1) and as "the intergeneric form of intertextuality" (16), which operates on the formal and the thematic level as well as through metageneric signals (22).

23 See Hardie 1990 on the Theban cycle in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Ambühl 2005 on Lucan.

cities.[24] The depictions of the Ilioupersis in Athenian tragedy and art in the wake of the Persian invasions form a complex response to the sack of Athens in 480 B.C., in the sense that the Persians at the same time represent the Trojan 'barbarians' as well as the Greek aggressors who destroyed the temples of Troy.[25] Half a century later, Euripides' Trojan tragedies with their focus on the fall of Troy and the sufferings of its victims reflect the contemporary Peloponnesian War, where Greeks are both victors and victims; they have often been read as warnings against Athenian imperialism in the sense that Athens may in turn suffer the fate of Troy if it uses its power in the wrong way.[26]

According to his companion Polybius (38.21-22), Scipio the Younger after razing Carthage in 146 B.C. quoted the famous lines from the *Iliad* where Hector predicts the fall of Troy (6.448f.), thus associating the captured city with Troy and at the same time musing on a similar fate that may befall Rome in the future; such an analogy between Troy and an imagined destruction of Rome also resonates in Roman poetry from the civil-war period.[27] All these factors may contribute towards explaining why the Ilioupersis formed an especially attractive subtext for Lucan in evoking the atrocities of the civil war between Marius and Sulla, as the following analysis will show in more detail.

3. Aesthetic Issues: The Ilioupersis and the Depiction of Atrocities

Besides being a rich literary motif, the Ilioupersis also functions as one of the focal points for studying the aesthetics of violence in antiquity.[28] In

24 See Paul 1982 and Rossi 2002; 2004: 17-53 on the *topos* of the *Urbs Capta* in ancient poetry, oratory and historiography, especially the so-called 'tragic history'.

25 The latter position is advocated by Ferrari 2000 in her interpretation of the Parthenon Ilioupersis and Aeschylus' *Persians* (472 B.C.) and *Agamemnon* (458 B.C.); on the image of the Ilioupersis in the *Agamemnon* see also Anderson 1997: 107-132. Phrynichus in his lost historical tragedy on the sack of Miletus by the Persians in 494 B.C. (*Miletou Halosis*, 492 B.C.) may also have made use of the Ilioupersis tradition.

26 Croally 1994 advances a political reading of Euripides' *Troades* in the context of Athenian war ideology. See now also Zeitlin 2009.

27 On the interconnections between Troy, Rome and Carthage and the variations of the motif of the destroyed vs. the eternal city in (pre-)Augustan poetry see Labate 1991.

28 Two recently published proceedings of colloquia address the issue of violence and its representation in classical Greece (Fischer and Moraw 2005; Seidensticker and Vöhler 2006), the latter from a specifically aesthetic point of view; several essays in both volumes treat themes from the Ilioupersis in poetry and the arts.

the poetic tradition as well as in pictorial representations, the narrative of the fall of Troy is marked by scenes of horror and brutality that transgress the usual norms of warfare.[29] Three major events stand out in this series of war crimes and sacrileges: the slaughter of Priam at the altar of Zeus, the political murder of Hector's little son Astyanax who is thrown from the city walls, and the sacrifice of Polyxena at Achilles' tomb. As we will see, all three of them appear in a transformed version in the old man's narrative.

But let us first focus on the more general picture in the introductory passage which evokes the day when Marius returned to Rome to take vengeance for his exile (Lucan. 2.98-104):[30]

pro fata, quis ille,
quis fuit ille dies, Marius quo moenia victor
corripuit, quantoque gradu mors saeva cucurrit! 100
nobilitas cum plebe perit, lateque vagatus
ensis, et a nullo revocatum pectore ferrum.
stat cruor in templis multaque rubentia caede
lubrica saxa madent.

In the name of Fate! What a day, what a day that was when Marius in victory seized the city-walls! How huge the strides of savage, racing death! Noble and plebeian together died, and the sword ranged far and wide, with blade called back from no one's breast. Deep stands the gore in the temples: the stones are slippery, drenched and reddened by much slaughter.

Some of the elements in this emphatic description can be related to a passage in Aeneas' narrative of the fall of Troy, for example the motif of the fatal day (98f.) to *Aen.* 2.324f. (*venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus/Dardaniae*),[31] or the desecration of temples (103f.) to the corpses scattered throughout the streets, houses and sanctuaries of Troy at the night of the sack (*Aen.* 2.364-366: *plurima perque vias sternuntur inertia passim/corpora perque domos et religiosa deorum/limina*). While Virgil closes with a generalizing image of death (2.368f.: *crudelis ubique/luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago*), Lucan's old man opens the passage with a personification of *mors saeva* (100). For the specific detail of blood standing in pools in the temples and the slippery stones (103f.), we

29 Anderson 1997: 244 and *passim*.

30 Latin passages from the *Bellum civile* are quoted from Shackleton Bailey's 1997 edition, translations from Braund 1992.

31 The motif ultimately goes back to the lines from the *Iliad* quoted by Scipio at Carthage (4.164f.=6.448f.; see above §2). Lausberg 1985: 1587 also notes the echo of the same lines in Lucan. 7.195f. (*'venit summa dies, geritur res maxima', dixit/'impia concurrunt Pompei et Caesaris arma'*), one of the many correspondences between the two books.

may of course think of Virgil's Priam slipping in the blood of his freshly killed son Polites at the altar in the courtyard of his palace (2.551);[32] yet the expression has an even closer parallel in Euripides *Troades*, where Poseidon deplores the desecration of Troy by the Greek victors (15f.): ἔρημα δ' ἄλση καὶ θεῶν ἀν'/φόνῳ καταρρεῖ – "The sacred groves are desolate and the sanctuaries of the gods are awash with blood."[33] Here Lucan apparently has gone back beyond the *Aeneid* to a more drastic image from Greek tragedy.

Throughout the speech, Lucan has the old man highlight the shocking nature of his narrative by interspersing personal comments in the form of exclamations, apostrophes and rhetorical questions, which aligns him with Lucan's primary narrator (especially in book 7).[34] So his general remarks that no age group was spared by Marius, neither the extremely aged nor the infant (104-109), culminate in a rhetorical question (108): *crimine quo parvi caedem potuere mereri?* – "For what crime could these little ones deserve to die?" His protest against the murder of innocent children can be related to a well-known motif from the Iliou persis, as his choice of the old man and the child as general examples (105: *senis*, 107: *infantis*) recall the fates of Priam and his grandson Astyanax respectively.[35] Even the specific form of the rhetorical question is paralleled by Andromache's and Hecuba's bitter questions addressed to the Greeks in Euripides' *Troades* (764f.):[36] ὦ βάρβαρ' ἐξευρόντες Ἕλληνες κακά,/τί τόνδε παῖδα κτείνετ' οὐδὲν αἴτιον; – "O you Greeks, you who have devised atrocities worthy of barbarians, why are you killing this innocent boy?"; (1159f.) τί τόνδ',

32 So Schmitt 1995: 56 n. 56.

33 Greek quotations from Euripides are taken form the editions by Diggle 1981 and 1984, translations from Morwood 2000.

34 Lucan. 2.98-100, 108, 116, 118-124, 126-128, 134-138, 173f., 190f., 221f. Cf. Fantham 1992: 93: "The high proportion of personal comment in this section, higher than L. allows himself in direct narrative (except perhaps during the conflict at Pharsalus), can hardly be treated as characterization [...]." On the frequent emotional intrusions into the narrative by Lucan's primary narrator see Schlonski 1995: esp. 99-132 on book 7; Narducci 2002: 88-106 and Effe 2004: 61-72 associate this technique with drama. On the thematic level, too, many motifs in the speech prefigure elements from the description of the battle at Pharsalus.

35 Whereas in the literary tradition the deaths of Priam and Astyanax are separated temporally and spatially, in pictorial representations on Attic vases they are often combined Anderson 1997: 192-199. On the fate of Priam recalled in the passage on the murder of the pontifex Scaevola (126-129) see below §4.

36 Fantham 1992: 100 *ad* 108. In Seneca *Troades* 1104-1109, Andromache states that this act surpasses any barbarian or mythical paradigms of cruelty, which is paralleled by the analogous list in a later passage of the old man's speech (162-165; cf. Fantham 1992: 110 *ad loc.*).

Ἀχαιοί, παῖδα δείσαντες φόνον/καινὸν διειργάσασθε; – "You Achaeans, [...], why were you so frightened of this boy that you committed a murder that has no precedent?" In a manner typical of Lucan's narrator, the old man answers the question himself by a capping paradox (109): *sed satis est iam posse mori* - "But now it is sufficient to be able to die."

After summing up the anonymous victims of Marius' massacres, the old man names a few individuals (119-129). The subsequent section on Sulla shows a related structure; the most prominent individual in this section is Marius Gratidianus, Marius' nephew, who was murdered at the grave of Catulus, one of Marius' political victims, by partisans of Sulla's (173-193).[37] His fate can be set into parallel to the third prominent war crime from the Ilioupersis, the sacrifice of Polyxena at Achilles' grave, since both are human victims offered at a tomb in a perversion of usual rites for appeasing the dead. The old man comments on the unspeakable character of this act of revenge and even its absurdity, for he doubts if the dead Catulus himself would have approved of it (173-176):

> quid sanguine manes
> placatos Catuli referam? cum victima tristis
> inferias Marius forsan nolentibus umbris
> pendit inexpleto non fanda piacula busto,
> [...]

Why tell of the ghost of Catulus appeased with blood? – when as victim Marius, with the shades perhaps not liking the bitter offerings, made a sacrifice unspeakable to a tomb never satisfied, [...]

The old man's futile protests against this sacrilegious act parallel the protests of Hecuba as she hears of the sacrifice of Polyxena in Euripides' *Hecuba* (260-263):[38]

> πότερα τὸ χρή σφ' ἐπήγαγ' ἀνθρωποσφάγειν
> πρὸς τύμβον, ἔνθα βουθυτεῖν μᾶλλον πρέπει;
> ἢ τοὺς κτανόντας ἀνταποκτεῖναι θέλων
> ἐς τήνδ' Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐνδίκως τείνει φόνον;

Was it necessity that persuaded them to slaughter a human at a tomb where oxen are the fitter sacrifice? Or if Achilles wants to take revenge by killing those that killed him, is it just that he should aim at a girl's death?

In Seneca's *Troades* the protests gain more weight, as they are not uttered by the directly affected party, but by the leader of the Greek army,

37 On the historical background see Fantham 1992: 112 *ad* 173-93; Dreyling 1999: 84f. *ad* 173-193.

38 Cf. Hecuba's bitter comments on the sacrifice of Polyxena in Euripides *Troades* 265-267 (unwittingly prophetic) and 628.

Agamemnon himself, who in vain tries to prevent Neoptolemus from committing this sacrilege – not only against Polyxena, but also against the recipient of the offering, Achilles (255f.: *Quid caede dira nobiles clari ducis/aspergis umbras?* – "Why do you spatter the shade of a glorious commander with dreadful slaughter?"; 298-300: *quis iste mos est? quando in inferias homo est/impensus hominis? detrahe invidiam tuo/odiumque patri, quem coli poena iubes* – "What is that practice you speak of? When has a man been due payment as funeral offering for another man? Take away the hateful tribute from your father, for you are demanding that he be honored by a penalty").[39] In their role as critics from within the community, both Agamemnon and the old man reveal that the supposed satisfaction of the dead with a human victim is but a pretext for brutal revenge by the living; yet in the end, both are ineffective voices. In this sense, the old man also mirrors Lucan's primary narrator, who, too, comes after the fact and can only lament or curse without being able to change the course of history.

The comparison of Marius Gratidianus with Polyxena is not meant to downplay the crucial differences in treatment. Whereas in tragedy human sacrifice is regularly compared to or contrasted with the ritual slaughtering of an animal and can be seen as a religious act in behalf of the whole community or even be transformed into a noble act of voluntary death as in the case of Polyxena in Euripides' *Hecuba* and Seneca's *Troades*,[40] in Marius' case the implicit paradigms from myth and poetry serve to underline the utterly unheroic character of this historical act of sadistic killing. We might of course also think of ambivalent precedents in epic such as Achilles' offering of twelve prisoners of war at Patroclus' pyre in the *Iliad* (23.175f.; cf. 21.26-32), which is echoed in Aeneas' analogous offering at Pallas' pyre in the *Aeneid* (11.81f.; cf. 10.517-520);[41] but there the actual act of killing is passed over quickly. In contrast, the passage

39 Text: Zwierlein 1986; translation: Fantham 1982 (see the commentary *ibid.* 253). Lucan's wording also closely resembles Hecuba's address to the dead Polyxena in Ovid *met.* 13.515f.: *hostilia busta piasti./inferias hosti peperi.* See below §4 for further reflections of the Ovidian passage.

40 See Henrichs 2000; 2006 on the representations and functions of human sacrifice in Greek tragedy; specifically on the sacrifice of Polyxena see Bremmer 2007: 59-65. A parallel case from the beginning of the Trojan War is the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (recently treated by Jan Bremmer in a lecture at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen): In Euripides' *Iphigeneia at Aulis* the notion of self-sacrifice for the community is highlighted, but there are voices that protest against human sacrifice, too. On the problematics of human sacrifice and its tragic connotations in Virgil see now Panoussi 2009: 13-44 and in Ovid Papaioannou 2007: 228-244.

41 Cf. Fantham 1992: 112f. *ad* 174-5. Interestingly, the *Aeneid* passage has often been taken to refer to a historical event: After the sack of Perugia Octavian

about Marius Gratidianus reaches its climax in the detailed description of his savage mutilation which leads to a cruelly slow death (177-193):

[...]
cum *laceros* artus aequataque vulnera membris
vidimus et toto quamvis in corpore caeso
nil animae letale datum, moremque nefandae
dirum saevitiae, pereuntis parcere morti.
avulsae cecidere *manus* exectaque lingua
palpitat et muto vacuum ferit aera motu.
hic *aures*, alius spiramina *naris* aduncae
amputat, ille cavis evolvit sedibus orbes
ultimaque effodit spectatis lumina membris.
vix erit ulla fides tam saevi criminis, unum
tot *poenas* cepisse caput. [...]
[...] quid perdere fructum
iuvit et, ut vilem, Marii confundere vultum?
ut scelus hoc Sullae caedesque ostensa placeret
agnoscendus erat.

[...] when we saw mangled limbs, each with a wound, and no death-blow dealt although the entire body was gashed; we saw the dreadful practice of unutterable cruelty - to keep alive the dying man. Down fell the hands, torn off; the cut-out tongue quivered, beating empty air with noiseless movement. One cut off his ears, another the hooked nose's nostrils; a third tears out the eyeballs from their hollow sockets and, compelling him to view his body, finally gouges out his eyes. Hardly will a crime so savage be believed, that one man can incur so many tortures. [...] What made them want to spoil their reward by mangling Marius' face, as if it were worthless? For this crime to please Sulla with proven murder, it had to be recognizable.

Conte has set the most striking features of this passage into an intertextual relationship with the mutilation of Philomela in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (6.557-560) and Oedipus' self-blinding in Seneca's tragedy (*Oed.* 965-969).[42] In addition, I suggest that another figure from the Iliouersis functions as a thematically even more closely related model, namely the badly mutilated shade of Deiphobus whom Aeneas meets in the underworld in book 6 of the *Aeneid* (494-547, esp. 494-501):[43]

is said to have offered 300 senators and knights like sacrificial animals at an altar for Divus Iulius on the Ides of March 40 B.C. (Suet. *Aug.* 15).

42 Conte 1968: 234-235.

43 Text and translation are quoted after Bleisch 1999, a stimulating reading of the passage. On Deiphobus as one of the images of fallen Troy in the *Aeneid* see also Ross 1998: 123f. Dreyling 1999: 87f. *ad* 183-184 briefly notes the passage.

Atque hic Priamiden laniatum corpore toto
Deiphobum *videt* et *lacerum* crudeliter ora, 495
ora *manusque* ambas, populataque tempora raptis
auribus et truncas inhonesto vulnere *naris*.
vix adeo *agnovit* pavitantem ac dira tegentem
supplicia, et notis compellat vocibus ultro:
'Deiphobe armipotens, genus alto a sanguine Teucri, 500
quis tam crudelis optavit sumere *poenas*? ...'

Here next he saw Deiphobus, Priam's son, mutilated from head to foot, his face and both hands cruelly torn, ears shorn away, nose to the noseholes lopped by a shameful stroke. Barely knowing the shade who quailed before him covering up his tortured face, Aeneas spoke out to him in his known voice: 'Deiphobus, mighty warrior, descendant of Teucer's lofty bloodline, who chose to exact such cruel punishments on you?...'

Deiphobus has been cruelly mutilated by Menelaus and other Greek leaders during the sack of Troy in revenge for his marriage with Helen. In his description of the revenge taken on Marius Gratidianus, the old man expands upon motifs already present in Virgil: the idea of mutilation (*lacer, manus, aures, naris*) as an especially cruel form of capital punishment (*poenas*), and the problem of recognition (*agnoscere*). But whereas the Virgilian narrator describes only the still visible effects of the mutilation (*videt*) and lets Deiphobus tactfully pass over a narrative of the actual deed (528-530), Lucan's old man focusses on the process of the mutilation as experienced by eyewitnesses (*vidimus*) and thus increases the graphic sense of horror.

The Ilioupersis subtext is for the last time evoked in the description how the course of the Tiber was blocked by the corpses of the Sullan massacres (209-220). Although this echoes a part of the story that precedes the fall of Troy, Achilles' fight with the river Scamander in *Iliad* 21,[44] the excessive cruelty of Achilles in this episode prefigures the war crimes committed by his son Neoptolemus during the sack of Troy. Both are connected in Catullus 64.357-360, where in the song of the Fates the reference to the Scamander is immediately followed by the sacrifice of Polyxena at Achilles' grave (362-371). In Catullus the fall of Troy announces the beginning of the Iron Age with its intimations of fratricide and civil war (397-408), a passage which had been evoked earlier in the old man's speech (2.148-151).

In aesthetic terms, the overall effect of the old man's speech with its dense accumulation of collective massacres and individual killings surpasses anything to be found in the previous epic or tragic tradition. Never-

44 Fantham 1992: 117f. *ad* 209-20 compares 211-213 with *Il.* 21.218-220 and 217f. with *Il.* 21.235-238.

theless, Lucan's use of the Ilioupersis as a subtext lends the speech an extra dimension by implying that the crimes which the Greeks committed during the capture of Troy have been repeated by the Romans within their own community. Paradoxically, this rewriting of the Ilioupersis as the worst excess of war known from the literary tradition forms only the prelude to the depiction of the Roman civil war in the rest of the *Bellum civile*, notably in the description of the battle at Pharsalus and its aftermath in book 7.

4. Narratological Issues: The Speech of the Old Man as an 'Autobiographical' Narrative in the Epic and Tragic Tradition

In narratological terms, the speech of the old man is to be defined as a first-person narrative by an internal secondary narrator in the form of an extended flashback. This speech has been set into relation to various models. In the first place, there are epic precedents for such flashbacks in character-speech, starting from Odysseus' Apologue in the *Odyssey*. For Lucan, the most obvious structural parallel is Aeneas' narrative of the fall of Troy in the second book of the *Aeneid*.[45] In contrast to the examples just mentioned, in Lucan the flashback is not put into the mouth of one of the protagonists of the epic, but given to an anonymous figure (2.67: *aliquis*). Therefore it has also been related to a further epic model, the so-called τις-speeches in Homer, short comments spoken by an anonymous figure representing a collective.[46] Along with the other anonymous speakers in Lucan, the speech of the old man thus accentuates the prominent role of the masses in his epic.[47] But this model cannot fully account for the characteristics of Lucan's flashback either, for these τις-speeches reflect collective opinion without any markedly personal tone. In the speech of the old man, however, there are passages which betray an intense personal engagement of the speaker. Moreover, as mentioned above, his narrative technique shows a remarkable affinity with Lucan's primary narrator, which lends him a special status among Lucan's anonymous speakers.

Therefore it may be profitable to look beyond the epic tradition for further possible precedents. Besides the thematic parallels mentioned above, there are also contacts with the genre of tragedy with regard to narratology. In drama, events that lie outside the dramatic action can be integrated by means of a messenger-speech, the speech of a character or a choral

45 E.g. Fantham 1992: 28.

46 On the τις-speeches in the *Iliad*, also sometimes called 'Chorreden', see de Jong 1987. Conte 1968: 243 and Schmitt 1995: 45 discuss the applicability of this model to the old man's speech.

47 See Schmitt 1995 and Gall 2005.

song. As a working hypothesis, the speech of Lucan's old man could be described as combining characteristics of an anonymous, all-encompassing account of past events in the style of a messenger-speech or choral song with the intensely personal, subjective recollections by a character in a tragic *rhesis*.

Lucan's old man has indeed been compared to a chorus or prologue speaker of a tragedy, who conjure up the horrors of the past as an announcement of impending disaster.[48] In the following, I will focus on the remaining two narrative modes from tragedy, the messenger-speech and the tragic *rhesis*. The model of the messenger-speech may explain why Lucan's old man possesses a broadness of vision that apparently surpasses the capacity of a single eyewitness.[49] As recent narratological analyses of tragic messenger-speeches have shown, tragic messengers, far from relating their message in a simple, straightforward manner, employ complex narrative techniques in order to convince their internal and external audience of their accounts.[50] Although presenting themselves as eyewitnesses, they can under certain circumstances expand their point of view to a more universal perspective; they use actualizing devices such as the historical present and subjective comments to bring the events directly before the eyes of the audience.

It is noteworthy that such a fusion of epic and tragic narrative patterns has a precedent in book 2 of the *Aeneid*. As Andreola Rossi has shown, Aeneas in his account of the capture of Troy makes use of the narrative techniques of tragic messenger-speeches.[51] Just as Aeneas defines himself right from the start as an eyewitness and protagonist of his tale (*Aen.* 2.5f.: *quaeque ipse miserrima vidi/et quorum pars magna fui*), so Lucan's old man establishes his credits as a reliable narrator by referring to his role as an eyewitness (178: *vidimus*), to his trustworthiness despite the unbelievable nature of the events (186: *vix erit ulla fides tam saevi*

48 Conte 1968: 242-244, Schmitt 1995: 10, 42, 44, 188 and Narducci 2002: 118 refer to the chorus in tragedy, Fantham 1992: 93 to the prologue speakers of Senecan drama. See also my general discussion of tragic patterns in the *Bellum civile* (Ambühl 2005: esp. 264-269).

49 See e.g. Fantham 1992: 120 *ad* 220 (a comparison with *Aeneid* 2): "[...] the bloodshed passes beyond the survivor's knowledge, and the pollution of the sea is not seen with the old man's memory, but the poet's vision."

50 De Jong 1991 on Euripidean messenger-speeches; Barrett 2002 on all three major Attic tragedians. See also the shorter comments in de Jong, Nünlist and Bowie 2004 (on messengers in Aeschylus Barrett 2002: 250-253, Sophocles de Jong 1991: 261-262 and Euripides Lowe: 273-274).

51 Rossi 2002: 249-251; 2004: 52-53; see also Deremetz 2000: esp. 83f. The *Troiae Halosis* in Petronius (see above §2) also assumes the form of a tragic messenger-speech Connors 1998: 87.

criminis), and to his personal involvement (169-173: see below); at two instances, like Aeneas or a tragic messenger, he professes his reluctance to tell at length of the horrible events he has witnessed (118f.: *cui funera vulgi/flere vacet?*; 173f.: *quid sanguine manes/placatos Catuli referam?*).[52] He also underlines the 'spectacular' quality of his tale by describing the massacre in the Ovilia as a spectacle for an internal spectator, Sulla (207f.: *spectator sceleris*), just as the messenger in Seneca's *Troades* describes the deaths of Astyanax and Polyxena as theatrical spectacles staged for an audience of Greeks and Trojans (1065-1179).[53]

Yet notwithstanding their subjective traits, the degree of personal involvement of tragic messengers is relatively low in comparison with Aeneas or with Lucan's old man. Moreover, in contrast to a messenger, Lucan's speaker does not give an account of recent events as yet unknown to the internal audience, but of things long past and known to both the internal and the external audience. In this way, rather than providing information, his speech has the character and function of a personal lament from the perspective of a surviving victim. Therefore, I adduce the tragic *rhesis* as a further narratological and indeed intertextual model, for as I would like to show, Lucan's old man is linked intertextually to the tragic figure of the old queen Hecuba. Just as Hecuba's memories span the whole time of the Trojan War back to its very origin in the birth of Paris, the old man figures as a spokesman of the memory of the elder generation. Although *parentes* in 64 and *senectus* in 232 may include old women as well, Lucan's choice of a male figure obviously reflects the political dimension of his tale.

The association with Hecuba has been prepared in the passage immediately preceding the old man's speech. The simile of a mother mourning the unexpected death of her son (2.21-28) may recall the tragic figure of Hecuba as the mythical *mater dolorosa*.[54] The subsequent procession of the women to the temples (28-36) forms a re-interpretation of the traditional scene of supplication known from the *Iliad* (6.269-312) and the *Aeneid* (1.479-482).[55] In contrast to the Trojan women, the Roman *ma-*

52 Cf. the introduction of Aeneas' tale in *Aen.* 2.3-13 (*Infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem* [...]) and 361f. (*quis cladem illius noctis, quis funera fando/explicet aut possit lacrimis aequare labores?*). On the metaliterary quality and the psychological function of Aeneas' recollections see Fernandelli 1999; Most 2003; Walde 2004.

53 On the 'spectacular' element in the *Bellum civile* see Leigh 1997 (esp. 289f., 300f. on this passage).

54 Cf. Fantham 1992: 84 *ad* 24, referring to Hecuba's grief for Hector in *Iliad* 24.

55 Fantham 1992: 84f. *ad* 30-6; on the motif in the epic tradition see also Kytzler 1968: esp. 51 n. 4; Lausberg 1985: 1588f. The supplication scene in *Aen.* 1.479-482 is depicted on Juno's temple at Carthage; cf. Aeneas' glimpse of the women

tronae approach the temples not in order to supplicate the gods as a last means to save the city from the impending doom, but in order to lament and address reproaches to the gods for having forsaken the city, as if they have lost faith in the gods who did not listen to the Trojan women either. One of them, a woman bearing the physical marks of excessive mourning, is singled out as a speaker (36f.: *quarum una madentis/scissa genas, planctu liventis atra lacertos*), just as Euripides' and Seneca's Hecuba is singled out from the chorus of Trojan women as their leader. But whereas Hecuba leads the lament after the fall of Troy, the Roman *matrona* urges her compatriots to lament in advance, for as soon as one of the rivals has won the civil war, they will have to rejoice (38-42). The women's reproaches towards the gods, along with the rhetorical questions and desperate wishes the narrator addresses to Jupiter at the beginning of book 2 (1-15), parallel the scepticism and bitterness of Hecuba's attitude towards the gods in the Trojan tragedies.[56]

This tragic subtext centered on Hecuba is carried further into the speech of the old man who embodies Rome's civil-war past. In Euripides' aftermath plays the broken figure of Hecuba functions as a symbol of Troy and its downfall after king Priam's death and the capture of the city.[57] As the sole survivor of the elder generation, Hecuba has witnessed the destruction of her whole family. In her tragic *rheseis*, she repeatedly stresses her role as an eyewitness to their death, so in her review of her life in Euripides' *Troades* (479-484):[58]

---

lamenting inside Priam's palace in 2.486-490 (Narducci 1973: 318f.; 1979: 49; 2002: 116f.).

56 E. *Tr.* 469-471, 884-888, 1240-1245, 1288-1290; cf. the chorus' reproaches to the gods in 820-859 and 1060-1080; see also Hecuba in Sen. *Tro.* 28. Interestingly, the alternative between Jupiter's providence and blind chance posed by the narrator in Lucan. 2.7-13 finds a close parallel at the beginning of Talthybius' speech in E. *Hec.* 488-491.

57 Another figure within the speech possibly evokes Hecuba, too: the previously powerful *senex* Marius in the wretched state of exile, lying on the soil of destroyed Carthage (68-93, esp. 90f.: *nuda triumphati iacuit per regna Iugurthae/et Poenos pressit cineres*), like Hecuba lying on the ground after the fall of Troy at the beginning of Euripides' *Troades*. Fantham 1992: 95 *ad* 75-8 refers to Sen. *Tro.* 1173f. for "the paradox of death shunning the fatal person" (Marius and Hecuba); cf. *Tro.* 954 (noted by Dreyling 1999: 45 *ad* 75-76). Carthage takes revenge on Rome through Marius with the help of the wrathful gods (86: *ingenti superum protectus ab ira*; cf. 2.1), just as the gods promise to take revenge on the Greek victors in the prologue to the *Troades*. This idea reinforces the implied association of the fates of Troy, Carthage and Rome (see above §2).

58 In Euripides' *Andromache*, the protagonist likewise stresses the fact that she witnessed the fates of her husband Hector and her son Astyanax with her own eyes (8-11, 399f.).

κἀκεῖνά τ᾽ εἶδον δορὶ πεσόνθ᾽ Ἑλληνικῷ
τρίχας τ᾽ ἐτμήθην τάσδε πρὸς τύμβοις νεκρῶν,
καὶ τὸν φυτουργὸν Πρίαμον οὐκ ἄλλων πάρα
κλύουσ᾽ ἔκλαυσα, τοῖσδε δ᾽ εἶδον ὄμμασιν
αὐτὴ κατασφαγέντ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ἑρκείῳ πυρᾷ
πόλιν θ᾽ ἁλοῦσαν.

And I saw them [sc. my children] fall beneath the Greek spear and had this hair of mine shorn at their corpses' graves. As for Priam, the father who begot them, I had not heard of his fate from others when I mourned him. No, it was with these very eyes that I saw him butchered at the household altar, with these same eyes that I saw my city captured.

This passage is taken up in Seneca's *Troades* (44-50):[59]

Vidi execrandum regiae caedis nefas
ipsasque ad aras maius admissum scelus
Aeacidae ⟨*ab*⟩ armis, cum ferox, laeva manu
coma reflectens regium torta caput,
alto nefandum vulneri ferrum abdidit;
quod penitus actum cum recepisset libens
ensis senili siccus e iugulo redit.

I saw the abominable deed of the king's murder, a crime all the greater because it was committed at the very altars by the armed violence of the son of Aeacus when, jerking the king's head back by the hair twisted in his left hand, the brutal Pyrrhus buried his accursed sword in the deep wound. And when the king gladly suffered the deep-driven blow, it came dry from the old man's throat.

The climax of both these tragic speeches is Hecuba's witnessing of Priam's murder at the altar. The Senecan passage finds close thematic and verbal parallels in the old man's description of how the old pontifex Scaevola was butchered at the altar of Vesta (Lucan. 2.126-129):[60]

59 Text in line 46 according to Fantham's 1982 edition. See also Sen. *Ag.* 656-658 (chorus): *vidi, vidi senis in iugulo/telum Pyrrhi vix exiguo/sanguine tingui.* On the "emphatic use of *videre* for witnessing tragic events" see Fantham 1992: 111 *ad* 162-3; cf. 1982: 214 *ad* 41-55, who refers to Ennius' *Andromacha* as the Latin model; see also Narducci 1979: 51f.; 2000: 253f.; 2002: 123f. In *Aeneid* 2, Aeneas, too, witnesses the murder of Priam with his own eyes (499-502: *vidi ipse furentem/caede Neoptolemum geminosque in limine Atridas,/vidi Hecubam centumque nurus Priamumque per aras/sanguine foedantem quos ipse sacraverat ignis*; 561f.: [...] *ut regem aequaevum crudeli vulnere vidi/vitam exhalantem* [...]); cf. Rossi 2004: 44-49.

60 On the poetical models and the textual problems of this passage see Fantham 1992: 105; Dreyling 1999: 66-69; Brena 1993; Narducci 2000; 2002: 122-125. The paradoxical idea of the bloodless slaughter originates in Ovid (*met.* 13.409f.: *exiguumque senis Priami Iovis ara cruorem/conbiberat*) and is expanded upon by Seneca and Lucan.

Te quoque neglectum violatae, Scaevola, Vestae
ante ipsum penetrale deae semperque calentis
mactavere focos; parvum sed fessa senectus
sanguinis effudit iugulo flammisque pepercit.

You too, Scaevola, they sacrificed, unheeded, before the very inner shrine and ever-burning hearths of desecrated Vesta: your weary old age poured from your throat a trickle of blood and allowed the flames to live.

The intertextual connection of Lucan's old man with Hecuba lends extra pathos to the implicit association of Scaevola with Priam, although in this case the speaker is not related to the victim by family and the motif of autopsy is replaced by apostrophe.

Instead, the intensely personal tone of Hecuba's memories is reflected in another moment of the old man's speech which forms its emotional climax. In the middle of his account of Sulla's proscriptions, he suddenly turns to his own personal memory (169-173):

meque ipsum memini, caesi deformia fratris
ora rogo cupidum vetitisque imponere flammis,
omnia Sullanae lustrasse cadavera pacis
perque omnis truncos, cum qua cervice recisum
conveniat, quaesisse, caput.

I recall how I myself, keen to place my slain brother's disfigured face on the pyre's forbidden flames, examined all the corpses of Sulla's peace and searched through all the headless bodies for a neck to match the severed head.

Through his example of a brother caring for a brother, the speaker sets a counterweight against the perversity of Sulla's proscriptions, where brothers have their brothers killed for a reward, as he had mentioned just a few lines before (151: *in fratrum ceciderunt praemia fratres*). In his concern to provide a proper burial for his brother, the speaker resembles the tragic Hecuba who organizes the funerals of her children Polyxena and Polydorus and her grandson Astyanax under precarious circumstances; in the passage from Seneca just quoted, burial is denied to Priam's mutilated corpse, as it is to the speaker's brother (*Troades* 54-56): *ille tot regum parens/caret sepulcro Priamus et flamma indigent/ardente Troia* – "Priam, that father of so many princes, lies without a tomb, and lacks a pyre, though all Troy is burning."[61]

In its strategic position in the speech, this 'autobiographical' moment parallels the decisive move in Aeneas' narrative in *Aeneid* 2, where he

61 Another possible tragic model is of course Antigone, who buries her brother Polyneices in defiance of Creon's prohibition. Propertius in 1.21 and 22 also mourns a close relative whose body was left unburied during the civil war at Perugia.

turns from the sight of Priam's murder (499-502) to the thought of his own family (559-563), and also the crucial moment when he recognizes himself among the figures on the pictures of Juno's temple in Carthage (1.488: *se quoque |...| agnovit*). In a more general sense, Virgil's reworking of the Ilioupersis functions as an important catalyst for Seneca's and Lucan's adaptations of Greek tragedy.[62] While Euripides concentrates upon the annihilation of the royal family before the background of the destruction of the city, in the *Aeneid*, this traditional focus on Priam, Hecuba and their children is supplemented by a new focus on the fate of Aeneas' own family with its implications for the future of Rome. At the same time, a transfer from myth to contemporary Roman history is effected through the implicit association of Priam's headless corpse lying on the shore (*Aen.* 2.557f.) with the decapitation of Pompey in Egypt, an image that has finally been realized in Lucan's narrative (Lucan. 1.685f.; 8.698f.).[63] Lucan's old man thus reverses Virgil's reinterpretation of the Ilioupersis myth in the light of history by associating 'his' Roman civil war with patterns familiar from myth and literature and describing it in terms of sacrilege, fratricide and the dissolution of families (148-151).[64]

In contrast to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 2, who delivers his speech at Dido's court in a situation of relative safety and relaxation, both Hecuba and Lucan's old man in their subjective perceptions stand at a turning-point from the bad to the worse. Therefore I return one more time to Euripides' Trojan tragedies as a subtext, for the connections between the old man's recollections and Hecuba's tragic speeches extend beyond the level of content into the structural level. While the former queen Hecuba together with the other captive women waits to be taken away to Greece as a slave, she is confronted with even worse news, the death of her last remaining children (Eur. *Hec.* 231-233):

κἄγωγ' ἄρ' οὐκ ἔθνῃσκον οὗ μ' ἐχρῆν θανεῖν,
οὐδ' ὤλεσέν με Ζεύς, τρέφει δ' ὅπως ὁρῶ
κακῶν κάκ' ἄλλα μείζον' ἡ τάλαιν' ἐγώ.

I now realize that I was not to die where I should have died. No, Zeus did not destroy me, but kept me alive so that I, Hecuba the wretched, could see new and greater agonies piled on agonies.

62 On Seneca's adaptation in the *Troades* of Virgil's Ilioupersis as well as Euripides' *Troades* and *Hecuba* see Fantham 1982: 50-75 and *passim*.

63 Narducci 1973; 1979: 43-48; 2002: 111-116. Note also the prominence of decapitation and *truncus* within the old man's speech (2.111f., 121-124, 150f., 160-173, 189), which "foreshadows Pompey's headless corpse" (Fantham 1992: 114 *ad* 189).

64 On Roman representations of civil war in the tragic terms of fratricide see Petrone 1996.

In a similar mood of resignation, the old man recalls the past sufferings under Marius and Sulla, only to state that the new civil war between Caesar and Pompey will surpass them by far (223-226):[65]

haec rursus patienda manent, hoc ordine belli
ibitur, hic stabit civilibus exitus armis.
quamquam agitant graviora metus, multumque coitur 225
humani generis maiore in proelia damno.

These sufferings await, again to be endured, this will be the sequence of the warfare, this will be the outcome fixed for civil strife. Yet greater threats arouse our fears, the rush to battle brings much greater loss to humankind.

The speech of Hecuba in Euripides' *Troades* (466-510), which is situated in between the horrible events of both the recent and the more distant past and the life as a slave awaiting her in the near future, shows close structural parallels with the authorial frame around the speech of the old man in Lucan. Hecuba draws a continuous line of her sufferings from the past to the present and into the future (467f.): πτωμάτων γὰρ ἄξια/πάσχω τε καὶ πέπονθα κἄτι πείσομαι – "For in the face of all I suffer, all I have suffered and shall go on to suffer, what can I do but fall?"; (498f.) οἵ γὼ τάλαινα, διὰ γάμον μιᾶς ἕνα/γυναικὸς οἵων ἔτυχον ὧν τε τεύξομαι – "Alas, how wretched I am. What sufferings have I met with, what sufferings lie in store for me – and all because of one marriage and one woman!"

Likewise, the authorial closing of the old man's speech links the older generation's memory of past sufferings with their fear of the future (232f.): *sic maesta senectus/praeteritique memor flebat metuensque futuri* – "Like this, melancholy elders lamented, remembering the past and fearful of the future."

In the authorial introduction of the speech, the intertextual associations of Lucan's old man with Hecuba are underlined by pointed verbal references to Latin texts that have themselves reworked the Trojan plays of Euripides. The tragic situation of the captive Hecuba lamenting her own fate and the deaths of her children is recreated within an epic context in book 13 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (494-532, esp. 516-519):[66]

quo ferrea resto?
quidve moror? quo me *servas*, annosa *senectus*?
quo, di crudeles, nisi uti nova funera cernam,
vivacem differtis anum?

65 On Marius and Sulla as prototypes of Caesar and Pompey and the idea of the repetition of history see Casamento 2005.

66 Quoted after Hill 2000. On Ovid's reworking of tragic models in his version of the fall of Troy see Papaioannou 2007: 207-251.

> Why do I stubbornly remain? For what do I linger on? Why do you preserve me, old age so full of years? Why, cruel gods, unless it is that I might see new funerals, do you keep a long-lived old woman waiting?

Ovid in turn is taken up by Seneca in *Troades* 41-43:

> Sed quid ruinas urbis eversae gemis,
> *vivax senectus*? respice infelix ad hos
> luctus recentes: Troia iam vetus est malum.
>
> But why do you grieve for the ruins of your overthrown city, old age too fond of life? Poor wretch, look at these fresh bereavements: Troy is now an outdated sorrow.

The introduction of the speech in Lucan echoes both Ovid and Seneca (64-66):[67] *at miseros angit sua cura parentes,/oderuntque gravis vivacia fata senectae/servatosque iterum bellis civilibus annos* – "But miserable parents are tormented by a special sorrow: they detest their long-enduring lot of oppressive age, their years preserved for civil war a second time." Through the thought that in times of war too long a life can be a curse, Hecuba's fate is here extended to a whole generation of Roman civil war victims.

It is interesting to note that the fearful anticipations of both Hecuba and the old man are not wholly confirmed by the course of events, at least not in the way they expect them to happen: Hecuba will not have to live as a slave in Greece, but instead will be turned into a dog and buried; Caesar's march on Rome will not end in a bloody massacre exceeding the example of Marius and Sulla. The announced fall of Rome never happens in book 3; the old man's speech functions as it narrative substitute, encompassing both actual past and potential future in an overwhelming poetic vision of death and destruction.

5. Conclusion

In his adaptation of the epic and tragic Ilioupersis tradition to the Roman civil war, Lucan turns intertextual memory into character memory. The paradigm of Hecuba not only functions as one of the narratological models for the speech of the old man, but also lends the experiences of the older generation in Lucan a deeper resonance by evoking tragic subtexts. In the old man's recollections, Hecuba's laments over the loss of her family are extended to the whole city of Rome, while his own family's civil war history still forms its central moment. The speech may thus be seen as mirroring the process of transforming history into poetry which makes

67 The parallels are briefly noted by Fantham 1992: 90 *ad* 65.

the *Bellum civile* such an intriguing epic. As the new civil war in the expectations of the older generation will exceed their earlier sufferings by far, so Lucan's aesthetics of violence surpasses its literary models.

Ut generos soceris mediae iunxere Sabinae: Die Gestalt Julias in der *Pharsalia* Lukans*

LISA SANNICANDRO

1. Die Frauengestalten in der *Pharsalia*

Trotz der wieder aufblühenden Studien über Lukan wurde die Analyse der Frauengestalten der *Pharsalia* sonderbarerweise vernachlässigt.[1] Viele Jahrzehnte hindurch wurden diese von der Kritik als rein dekorative Elemente der jeweiligen männlichen Partner deklassiert,[2] wobei jedoch einem aufmerksamen Leser des Epos deutlich wird, dass die Frauen aktiv an der Handlung beteiligt sind. Zum Beispiel erfüllt Marcia, die Frau Catos, eine öffentliche Funktion, weil sie ihre Fruchtbarkeit dem Staat zur Verfügung stellt und entscheidet, Cato in seinen militärischen Operationen zu begleiten.[3] Julia, Tochter Caesars und vierte Frau des Pompeius, besiegelt mit ihrer Ehe das erste Triumvirat und beschleunigt mit ihrem Tod den Ausbruch des Bürgerkrieges. Cornelia, die fünfte Frau des Pompeius, hat nach dessen Ermordung die wichtige Aufgabe, das Testament des Magnus seinen Söhnen Sextus und Gnaeus mitzuteilen: Auf diese Weise dient sie dem

* Ich möchte Christiane Reitz und Nicola Hömke für die Einladung zu dieser Tagung danken. Des Weiteren möchte ich Christine Walde für ihre nützlichen Anmerkungen zu diesem Beitrag danken.

1 Die einzige Ausnahme stellt die Arbeit von Finiello 2005 dar, in der die Forscherin eine allen Frauenfiguren der *Pharsalia* gemeinsame Eigenschaft feststellt. Es handelt sich um den ‚furialen' und überweltlichen Charakter, wie auch ein sozusagen utilitaristisches Verhalten: Der Bürgerkrieg sei die Gelegenheit, um daraus einen persönlichen Vorteil zu ziehen (im Falle der Marcia eine Entschädigung für das erfahrene Unrecht, weil Cato sie an Hortensius abgetreten hat; für Julia die Wiedererlangung ihres Ehemannes; für Erictho die Möglichkeit, sich Leichen für ihre magischen Übungen zu verschaffen).

2 Vgl. Bruère 1951: 221; Ahl 1976: 116: "Only Cornelia is given a truly independent characterization; the others are used chiefly to supply an additional color to Cato and Caesar."

3 Lucan. 2,326-380. Über die Figur Marcias in der *Pharsalia* siehe Sannicandro 2007 und Harich 1990.

Ziel, den Kampf gegen Caesar unter der Leitung Catos zu legitimieren.[4] Sie ist deswegen das Bindeglied zwischen der ersten und der zweiten Phase des Bürgerkrieges. Zu nennen ist natürlich auch Cleopatra, deren Ehrgeiz und politische Unternehmungslust der Dichter hervorhebt.[5] Neben diesen historischen Frauengestalten gibt es außerdem die Hexe Erichtho, die Priesterin Phemonoe und die von Apollo besessene Matrone, die den katastrophalen Ausgang des Bürgerkriegs prophezeien.[6] Es wäre demnach ausgesprochen oberflächlich, diese Figuren als Randfiguren abzufertigen, wo sie doch gerade dank dieser mehr oder weniger bewussten Teilnahme am Geschehen eine öffentliche oder politische Rolle haben, die eng mit ihrer Rolle als Gattin oder Mutter verbunden ist:[7] Die Konvergenz von öffentlicher und privater Dimension steht in der *Pharsalia* im Mittelpunkt, so dass das Schicksal einer Familie in das von Roms einbezogen wird.

Da die *Pharsalia* von einem *bellum plus quam civile* erzählt, muss sie vor allem als Epos der Auflösung der verwandtschaftlichen Beziehungen gelesen werden: Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Caesar und Pompeius, jeweils Schwiegervater und -sohn, stellt die extreme Degenerierung des Bürgerkriegs dar und nimmt demnach die Gestalt eines *nefas* an. Dem politischen Chaos, das vom *bellum civile* verursacht wurde, entspricht demzufolge ein Chaos in den verwandtschaftlichen Beziehungen, eine radikale Umwälzung des Bundes zwischen Vater und Sohn, Bruder und Bruder, Schwiegervater und Schwiegersohn. Der Tod der *res publica* wird also von der Auflösung ihrer ersten Einheit – der Familie – verursacht. Nur eine Frau wäre durch ihre Aktion imstande gewesen, die Integrität der Familie und des Staates zu wahren: Es ist Julia, die Tochter Caesars und Frau des Pompeius, deren Tod im Epos als Beschleunigung der Handlung dient.

2. Julia und die Semantik des Blutes

Der Julia wird nur dem Anschein nach weniger Platz als den anderen Frauengestalten eingeräumt. Obwohl sie im Epos nur fünfmal auftritt,[8]

4 Cornelia erscheint in Lucan. 5,722-815; 8,40-158 und 577-662; 9,51-116 und 167-179.

5 Lucan. 10,53-171.

6 Die drei Prophetinnen erscheinen jeweils in 6,507-830; 5,120-236; 1,673-695. Diesen Frauengestalten kann man auch die personifizierte Roma, die Caesar am Rubikon erscheint (1,183-212), sowie einige mythologische Frauengestalten (Medusa, Agave, Medea, Helena, die Sabinerinnen ...) und eine Gruppe anonymer Matronen (2,28-42) hinzufügen.

7 Natürlich bilden in diesem Falle die Figuren der Hexe Erictho und der Priesterin Phemonoe eine Ausnahme.

8 Julia wird vom Dichter in 1,111-120; 5,468-475; 9,1046-1051; 10,77-78 erwähnt; sie erscheint Pompeius im Traum in 3,8-40.

ist ihre Anwesenheit beständig, weil sie indirekt immer dann aufscheint, wenn Caesar und Pompeius jeweils *socer* und *gener* genannt werden.[9] Julia, Tochter Caesars und vierte Frau des Pompeius, starb im Jahre 54 v.Chr. noch sehr jung im Wochenbett; auch das Kind, das sie geboren hatte, überlebte sie nur um einige Tage.[10] Der Tod der jungen Frau, deren Hochzeit mit Pompeius eine ohnehin schon schwache politische Allianz zwischen ihm und Caesar besiegeln sollte, brach den Pakt des Ersten Triumvirats und führte kurz darauf zum Bürgerkrieg. Nach Meinung des Dichters hätte einzig ihr Einschreiten den *furor* Caesars und Pompeius' bremsen und somit den Ausbruch des Bürgerkriegs verhindern können. Laut den historischen Zeugnissen war die Liebe zwischen den Ehegatten sehr tief: Pompeius wurde sogar beschuldigt, wegen seiner Frau die Politik zu vernachlässigen.[11] Die Historiker heben außerdem hervor, dass Julia das ausgleichende Element in der politischen Allianz zwischen *socer* und *gener* war: In der Tat wird sie in den Quellen immer als *pignus concordiae*, als Garantin des Friedens, beschrieben.[12]

Das gilt auch in der *Pharsalia*. Der frühzeitige Tod Julias löschte zusammen mit der politischen Allianz auch die Verwandtschaft zwischen Schwiegervater und Schwiegersohn aus und ist somit für Lukan eine der Ursachen des Konfliktes, wie aus dem Proömium ersichtlich wird:[13]

Nam pignora iuncti
sanguinis et diro feralis omine taedas
abstulit ad manis Parcarum Iulia saeva
intercepta manu. Quod si tibi fata dedissent
maiores in luce moras, tu sola furentem 115
inde virum poteras atque hinc retinere parentem
armatasque manus excusso iungere ferro,
ut generos soceris mediae iunxere Sabinae.

9 Über den Gebrauch der Verwandtschaftstermini *socer* und *gener* bei Lukan vgl. Viansino 1974: 9-15.

10 Nach Suet. *Iul.* 26 handelte es sich bei dem Kind von Julia und Pompeius um ein Mädchen, hingegen nach Vell. 2,47,2 um einen Jungen.

11 Vgl. Plut. *Pomp.* 48,8 und 53,3-5; Val. Max. 4,6,4.

12 Vgl. Vell. 2,47,2: *quarto ferme anno, Caesar morabatur in Galliis, cum medium iam ex invidia potentiae male cohaerentis inter Cn. Pompeium et C. Caesarem concordiae pignus Iuliae, uxor Magni, decessit; atque omnia inter destinatos tanto discrimini duces dirimente Fortuna filius quoque parvus Pompei, Iulia natus, intra breve spatium obiit*; Flor. *epit.* 2,13,13: *Crassi morte apud Parthos et morte Iuliae Caesaris filiae, quae nupta Pompeio generi socerique concordiam matrimonii foedere tenebat, statim aemulatio erupit*; Val. Max. 4,6,4: [...] *cuius tranquillitas [sc. rei publicae] tot civilium bellorum truculentissimo furore perturbata non esset, si Caesaris et Pompei concordia communis sanguinis vinculo constricta mansisset.*

13 Die Stellen der *Pharsalia* sind zitiert nach Badalì 1992.

Morte tua discussa fides bellumque movere
permissum ducibus. 120
(Lucan. 1,111-120)

Die Geschichte Julias hebt den großen politischen Wert der römischen Ehe hervor, deren Ziel es war, mehrere Familiengruppen durch Zeugung von Kindern zusammenzuschließen. Durch die Söhne und Töchter, die ihr Blut vermischen, wird die Union zweier Familien erzielt.[14] In einer so konzipierten Ehe verwirklicht sich demnach die sogenannte ‚konnektive' Funktion des Blutes, welches auch ein kennzeichnendes Element der politischen Allianz wird. Der Dichter macht im Proömium bewusst Gebrauch vom Verwandtschafts-Wortschatz mit dem Ziel, die Frau als Garantin der familiären Einheit darzustellen: Lukan definiert aus dem Blickwinkel Julias Caesar als *parens* und Pompeius als *vir* (v. 116). Aus diesem Grund wird das Kind, dem Julia das Leben geschenkt hatte und das, wie schon gesagt, wenige Tage nach seiner Mutter starb, in vv. 111-112 *pignora iuncti/sanguinis*, zum „Unterpfand der Blutsbande" zwischen Caesar und Pompeius. Die ‚konnektive' Handlungsweise der jungen Frau wird weiterhin hervorgehoben durch den beharrlichen Gebrauch von *iungere*, einem Verb, das die politische und vitale Dimension des Blutes ausdrückt (vv. 111-112: *pignora iuncti/sanguinis*; v. 117: *armataque manus* [...] *iungere* und v. 118: *ut generos socerisque mediae iunxere Sabinae*).[15] Die Vorstellung Julias findet in v. 118 ihren Höhepunkt mit dem ersten der historischen Vergleiche der *Pharsalia*: Wäre sie nicht frühzeitig gestorben, hätte Julia den Kampf zwischen Schwiegersohn und Schwiegervater verhindern und so dieselbe Rolle wie die Sabinerinnen einnehmen können.[16]

Lukan führt hier die Semantik der Blutsbande ein, die an allen Stellen vorkommt, wo Julia auftritt. Das geschieht z.B. in 5,468-475 im Kontext einer leidenschaftlichen Apostrophe an Pompeius. Die beiden gegnerischen Heere sind nach Epirus gelangt, wo sie ihr Lager aufgestellt haben und sich nun kampfbereit gegenüberstehen. Diese Gelegenheit wird für Caesar – so sagt der Dichter – die letzte Möglichkeit sein, den Schwiegersohn von nahem zu beobachten. In der Tat hätte er kurz darauf nurmehr seine Leiche auf dem ägyptischen Strand sehen können:

Hoc Fortuna loco tantae duo nomina famae
conposuit miserique fuit spes inrita mundi
posse duces parva campi statione diremptos 470
admotum damnare nefas: nam cernere voltus
et voces audire datur multosque per annos
dilectus tibi, Magne, socer post pignora tanta,

14 Vgl. Guastella 1985.

15 Siehe hierzu Guastella 1985: 57-65.

16 Über diesen Vergleich siehe *infra*.

sanguinis infausti subolem mortemque nepotum,
te nisi Niliaca propius non vidit harena. 475
(Lucan. 5,468-475)

Hier wird Julia als *pignus* (v. 473: *post pignora tanta*) definiert. Dasselbe gilt für ihr Kind, das sie von Pompeius hatte: Auch dieses ist die Frucht einer unglückbringenden Union (v. 474: *sanguinis infausti subolem*).

Julia wird auch in 9,1048-1049 erwähnt. Als Caesar das abgeschlagene Haupt des Pompeius sieht, heuchelt er Tränen. Dann wendet sich der Dichter an ihn mit einer pathetischen Apostrophe, in der das Motiv der Verwandtschaft noch einmal wiederkehrt:

O sors durissima fati!
Huncine tu, Caesar, scelerato Marte petisti,
qui tibi flendus erat? Non mixti foedera tangunt
te generis nec gnata iubet maerere neposque:
credis apud populos Pompei nomen amantis 1050
hoc castris prodesse tuis.
(Lucan. 9,1046-1051)

Das Blutmotiv kehrt auch im zehnten Buch wieder, als Lukan in einer Apostrophe an Julia das Verhalten Caesars missbilligt, weil er sich einer außerehelichen Beziehung mit Kleopatra schuldig gemacht hatte, aus der ein uneheliches Kind, Caesarion, hervorgegangen war:

Oblitus Magni tibi, Iulia, fratres
obscaena de matre dedit partesque fugatas
passus in extremis Libyae coalescere regnis
tempora Niliaco turpis dependit amori, 80
dum donare Pharon, dum non sibi vincere mavolt.
(Lucan. 10,77-81)

Julia, Angehörige der *gens Iulia*, hat aufgrund des niederträchtigen Verhaltens ihres Vaters einen Bruder, der *obscaena de matre* geboren ist: Er hat sozusagen ihr adliges Blut befleckt, das einst zwei Familien vereint hat.

Es zeigt sich also, dass an den Stellen der *Pharsalia*, an denen Julia vorkommt, das Blutmotiv und jenes des *pignus* die wichtige kohäsive Funktion dieser Frauenfigur im Bereich der Familie und der *res publica* hervorheben sollen.

3. Julia und die Sabinerinnen

In Lucan. 1,118 werden die Sabinerinnen als *exemplum* von Vermittlungs- und Wiedervereinigungsfähigkeit der *civitas*-Einheit angeführt. Ich halte

die Gleichsetzung Julias mit diesem mythologischen Paradigma für sehr bedeutungsvoll, da die Sabinerinnen in der ersten Phase der Geschichte Roms eine schwere Krise des jungen römischen Staates zu lösen vermochten, indem sie in den Konflikt zwischen Vätern und Ehemännern eingriffen. Aufgrund der Nähe, die sich zwischen den beiden Völkern entwickelt hatte, kann dieser Konflikt als erster großer Bürgerkrieg Roms angesehen werden. Dieser Vergleich des v. 118 zeichnet sich durch eine beträchtliche Ausdruckskraft aus, da er in einem einzigen Vers die Episode der Sabinerinnen zusammenfasst, die von Liv. 1,13,4ff. und von Ovid *fast.* 3,202ff. dargestellt wird.[17]

In einem Beitrag des Jahres 1995 hat Robert Brown festgestellt, dass Livius in seiner Bearbeitung der Sabinerinnen-Episode diesen Frauen die Vermittlungsfunktion zwischen Schwiegervätern und -söhnen zugesteht, die Julia zwischen Caesar und Pompeius nicht auszuüben vermochte: Der aus Padua gebürtige Historiker habe nämlich, beeinflusst von den Analogien zwischen der überlieferten Episode und diesem Ereignis der jüngsten Vergangenheit, diese Seiten seines Geschichtswerks geschrieben und dabei an die Geschichte Julias, Caesars und Pompeius' gedacht.[18] In der Geschichte der Sabinerinnen, wie auch in jener Julias, ist in der Tat die Verherrlichung der familiären *pietas* zu bemerken, eines Wertes, der sich aber auf den viel größeren Bereich der Gesellschaft und des Staates ausweitet.

Hier ist es angebracht, einen Blick auf die beiden Versionen der Episode zu werfen, die jeweils von Livius und Ovid geboten werden. Die Erzählung des Livius gelangt zu einem Spannungshöhepunkt, als die Sabinerinnen furchtlos auf das Kampffeld treten, gleichgültig gegenüber den Pfeilen, und versuchen, den Frieden zwischen Ehegatten und Vätern, d.h. zwischen Schwiegervätern und Schwiegersöhnen wiederherzustellen:

17 Vgl. Aymard 1951: 38. Im Geschichtswerk des Livius, das als eine der Quellen der *Pharsalia* anerkannt wird, konnte Lukan mehrere Episoden der römischen Vergangenheit finden, in denen es den Frauen gelungen war, für die *civitas* kritische Situationen zu lösen: Man denke nicht nur an die Episode der Sabinerinnen, sondern auch an die Vermittlungsgabe Veturias, der Mutter des Coriolanus (Liv. 2,40,3-9). Hinsichtlich dieser wichtigen Frauengestalten siehe Kowalewski 2002: 17-42.

18 Vgl. Brown 1995: 317: "For Livy, the war between the Romans and Sabines and the intervention of the women must have had a special resonance with the recent civil wars. So close indeed is the relationship between the opposing sides, so eloquently emphasized by the Sabine women, that the war between the Romans and the Sabines takes on the complexion of a civil war. Specifically, it echoes the war between Pompey and Caesar, inasmuch as the marriage of Pompey to Julia made it possible to think of the civil war as a contest between son-in-law and father-in-law (even though Julia had been dead for five years when it started!)." Vgl. auch Petrone 1996: 36 und Jal 1963: 410-411.

(1) Tum Sabinae mulieres, quarum ex iniuria bellum ortum erat, crinibus passis scissaque veste, victo malis muliebri pavore, ausae se inter tela volantia inferre, ex transverso impetu facto dirimere infestas acies, dirimere iras, (2) hinc patres, hinc viros orantes, ne se sanguine nefando soceri generique respergerent, ne parricidio macularent partus suos, nepotum illi, hi liberum progeniem. (3) 'Si adfinitatis inter vos, si conubii piget, in nos vertite iras; nos causa belli, nos volnerum ac caedium viris ac parentibus sumus; melius peribimus quam sine alteris vestrum viduae aut orbae vivemus'. (4) Movet res cum multitudinem tum duces; silentium et repentina fit quies; inde ad foedus faciendum duces prodeunt; nec pacem modo, sed civitatem unam ex duabus faciunt. Regnum consociant; imperium omne conferunt Romam.

(Liv. 1,13,1-4)

Auch Ovid sieht im Konflikt zwischen Römern und Sabinern eine Art Ankündigung des Bürgerkrieg zwischen Caesar und Pompeius: *tum primum generi intulit arma socer* (Ov. *fast.* 3,202). Seine Erzählung weist einige Unterschiede zur livianischen Version auf: Der Eingriff der Frauen zwischen den beiden Heeren findet vor der Schlacht statt:

Iamque fere raptae matrum quoque nomen habebant,
tractaque erant longa bella propinqua mora.
Conveniunt nuptae dictam Iunonis in aedem,
Quas inter mea sic et nurus ausa loqui:
‚O pariter raptae, quoniam hoc commune tenemus,
non ultra lente possumus esse piae.
Stant acies: sed utra di sint pro parte rogandi
eligite; hinc coniunx, hinc pater arma tenet.
Quaerendum est viduae fieri malitis an orbae.
Consilium vobis forte piumque dabo'.
Consilium dederat: parent, crinesque resolvunt
maestaque funerea corpora veste tegunt.
Iam steterant acies ferro mortique paratae,
iam lituus pugnae signa daturus erat,
cum raptae veniunt inter patresque virosque,
inque sinu natos, pignora cara, tenent.
Ut medium campi passis tetigere capillis,
in terram posito procubuere genu:
et, quasi sentirent, blando clamore nepotes
tendebunt ad avos bracchia parva suos.
Qui poterat, clamabat avum tum denique visum,
et, qui vix poterat, posse coactus erat.

Tela viris animique cadunt, gladiisque remotis 225
dant soceri generis accipiuntque manus,
laudataque tenent natas, scutoque nepotem
fert avus: hic scuti dulcior usus erat.
(Ov. fast. 3,203-228)

In diesen Versionen von Livius und Ovid kann man leicht eine Kombination von Motiven erkennen, die auch im Proömium der *Pharsalia* vorkommen. Sowohl im Livius- als auch im Ovidtext gibt es eine wirkungsvolle Konzentration der Verwandtschaftstermini, die die Unmenschlichkeit dieses Krieges zwischen Römern und Sabinern betonen will (Ov. *fast.* 3,202: *tum primum generi intulit arma socer*; Liv. 1,13,2: *hinc patres, hinc viros orantes*; Ov. *fast.* 3,210: *hinc coniunx, hinc pater arma tenet*; vgl. außerdem Liv. 1,13,3: *viduae aut orbae* mit Ov. *fast.* 3,211: *quaerendum est viduae fieri malitis an orbae*). Besonders in Lucan. 1,116 kann man die Wiederaufnahme derselben kontrastiven Struktur des livianischen und ovidischen Textes erkennen, die durch die Adverben *inde* und *hinc* betont werden: *tu sola furentem/inde virum poteras atque hinc retinere parentem* (vgl. Liv. 1,13,2: *hinc patres, hinc viros orantes*; Ov. *fast.* 3,210: *hinc coniunx, hinc pater arma tenet*). Die Aufeinanderfolge der Antithesen des livianischen Textes, die sich bei Lukan auf die einfache Korrelation von *inde – hinc* beschränkt, hat nicht nur ein rhetorisches Ziel, sondern gibt auch verbal die körperlich und familiär zentrale Rolle sowohl der Sabinerinnen als auch der Julia wieder, die zwischen zwei Gegnern stehen.

Weiterhin betonen sowohl Livius als auch Lukan das Motiv der *fides*, das allerdings jeweils zu einem anderen Ende führt: Die Vermittlungskraft der Sabinerinnen bewirkt, dass die Führer der beiden Parteien nicht nur Frieden, sondern auch einen Allianzpakt schließen (Liv. 1,13,4: *inde ad foedus faciendum duces prodeunt*). Hingegen hat der Tod Julias zur Folge, dass das *foedus* zwischen den Triumvirn aufgelöst wird (vgl. Lucan. 1,119: *morte tua discussa fides* und 1,4: *rupto foedere regni*).

Die Erzählung des Livius wiederum stellt das Motiv der *concordia* in den Vordergrund: Im Epilog der Episode schreibt der Autor, dass nach der Vermittlung der Frauen *non modo commune sed concors etiam regnum duobus regibus fuit* (Liv. 1,13,8). Lukan definiert das erste Triumvirat als *communis*, aber nicht *concors*, d. h. das Triumvirat hat nicht die Übereinstimmung in den Absichten, die notwendig wäre für eine *res publica*. Man sehe hierzu die Apostrophe an Rom in 1,84-86: *tu causa malorum/facta tribus dominis communis, Roma, nec umquam/in turbam missi feralia foedera regni:* Rom ist im gemeinsamen Besitz von drei Herrschern, die jedoch wegen ihres Machtdrangs *male concordes* (1,87) sind. Wenige Verse später wird das Verhältnis zwischen den Triumvirn wirkungsvoll definiert durch die *iunctura* des Horaz *concordia discors* (1,98): Dieser Gebrauch ist

besonders interessant, weil Lukan das empedokleische Konzept der Harmonie zwischen den Gegensätzen auf einen politischen Pakt anwendet, dessen Scheitern kosmische Konsequenzen hatte. Das Erlangen der *concordia* wäre nur möglich gewesen, wenn Julia ihre Vermittlungsfähigkeit ins Spiel gebracht hätte, wie es ihrerseits die Sabinerinnen getan hatten.

Dass Ovid – im Unterschied zu Livius – auch den Kindern eine wichtige Rolle zugesteht, ist nennenswert: Die Frauen nehmen sie auf das Schlachtfeld mit. Die Kinder werden als *pignora cara* definiert (wie das Kind Julias und des Pompeius), und stellen das Siegel der Verbindung zwischen den beiden Völkern durch die Ehe dar (Ov. *fast.* 3,218). Abschließend kann man sagen, dass in der dichterischen Aufarbeitung der Geschichte von Julia, Caesar und Pompeius die Erinnerung des Dichters an die Episode der Sabinerinnen eine wichtige Rolle gespielt hat. Deren glücklicher Ausgang erfuhr in den letzten Jahren der Republik einen dramatischen Umsturz.

4. Der Einfluss des thebanischen Mythos: Julia und Iokaste

In einem ausführlichen Beitrag hat Annemarie Ambühl[19] die Wichtigkeit des Einflusses der thebanischen Sage auf die lukanische Darstellung des Bürgerkrieges betont. Die Geschichte von Oedipus' Söhnen Eteokles und Polyneikes, die in einen mörderischen Bruderzwist verwickelt waren, war zur Zeit der Bürgerkriege in Rom sehr aktuell: Im kollektiven Bewusstsein der Römer hatten die Tragödien der thebanischen Sage innerfamiliäre Kriege auf die Bühne gebracht und diese zu Modellen in der Darstellung des Bürgerkrieges gemacht. Theben wurde zu einer mythologischen Entsprechung zu Rom, und der Kampf zwischen Eteokles und Polyneikes wurde zu einem mythologischen Archetypus des Krieges zwischen Caesar und Pompeius.[20] Die Bezugnahme auf den Mythos des Oedipus und seiner Nachkommen wird im ersten Buch deutlich, wenn die beunruhigenden Vorzeichen beschrieben werden, die den Bürgerkrieg voraussagen. Unter diesen nennt der Dichter auch die Zweiteilung der Flamme der Vesta (Lucan. 1,549-552).[21] Die Spaltung der Flamme erinnert den Leser an die Pyromantie-Szene in Senecas *Oedipus*, wo dasselbe Phänomen beschrieben wird (Sen. *Oed.* 321-323: *sed ecce pugnax ignis in partes duas/discedit et se scindit unius sacri/discors favilla*): Dieses Phänomen steht in der

19 Ambühl 2005.

20 Vgl. Barchiesi 1988: 19: „L'immagine dei Sette che assaltano Tebe guidati da una fazione tebana si imponeva come memento simbolico delle discordie distruttive che incombono su una comunità."

21 *Vestali raptus ab ara/ignis et ostendens confectas flamma Latinas/scinditur in partes geminoque cacumine surgit/Thebanos imitata rogos.*

Tragödie nicht nur für Oedipus' Kampf gegen sich selbst, der seinen Höhepunkt in der Selbstblendung des Helden findet, sondern auch für den kommenden Krieg zwischen seinen Kindern Eteokles und Polyneikes. In der *Pharsalia* kündigt die Teilung der Flamme in zwei Zungen ihrerseits den unwiderruflichen Bruch zwischen Caesar und Pompeius an, die wie Eteokles und Polyneikes auch Verwandte sind – dank der Hochzeit des Pompeius mit Julia.

In Lukans Werk drängt sich durch den Bezug auf die thebanische Sage einen Vergleich der jungen Tochter Caesars mit Iokaste geradezu auf. Diese versuchte erfolglos, den Kampf der zwei Söhne zu schlichten. Die Mutter und Frau des Oedipus war in Rom eine bekannte Figur dank Senecas *Phoenissae*, einer unvollendeten Tragödie, die viele gemeinsame Motive mit der *Pharsalia* aufweist.[22] Sowohl die Iokaste des Euripides als auch jene Senecas versuchen, die Einheit ihrer Familie wiederherzustellen; die literarische Aufarbeitung des berühmten römischen Mythos der Sabinerinnen, die sich zwischen Väter und Ehegatten stellen, ist anscheinend von der thebanischen Sage beeinflusst worden.[23] Als Beweis wird ein Fragment der *praetexta Sabinae* des Ennius genannt (*scaen.* 370 V.^{2}), das einen Teil der Rede der Frauen wiedergibt, in dem auf die verwandtschaftlichen Beziehungen hingewiesen wird, die zwischen den zwei Kriegsparteien bestehen: *cum spolia generis detraxeritis /quam inscriptionem dabitis?*[24] Alessandro Barchiesi bemerkt dazu: „alla conclusione positiva della storia, che vedeva consacrata dal successo la supplica delle Sabine, non poteva mancare un effetto edificante; se Ennio realmente dava spazio al modello di Euripide, l'effetto poteva contare anche su una tensione contrastiva".[25] In der Geschichte der Julia – die die dreifache Rolle der Tochter, Ehefrau und Mutter erfüllen muss – verschmelzen also zwei Modelle, ein mythologisches (Iokaste) und ein historisch-sagenhaftes (die Sabinerinnen): Aber im Unterschied zu diesen berühmten Beispielen verhindert der Tod der lukanischen Heldin deren Vermittlerfunktion, die für Rom lebenswichtig gewesen wäre.

22 Hierzu vgl. Barchiesi 1988: 9-39.

23 Vgl. Mazzoli 2002: 162.

24 Petrone 1996: 36-37 stellt fest, dass die Worte der Sabinerinnen an die Gegner in der livianischen Erzählung einen tragischen Ton haben, und erinnert an das Modell der Frauengestalt, die sich für die Wiederherstellung des Friedens im Streit zwischen ihren Verwandten aufopfern würden (vgl. Liv. 1,13,3: *in nos vertite iras*). Über das Thema siehe auch La Penna 1994.

25 Barchiesi 1988: 105 n. 12.

5. Der Traum des Pompeius (Lucan. 3,8-40)

Sehen wir uns jetzt die einzige Stelle der *Pharsalia* genauer an, an der Julia auftritt. Das Ende des zweiten Buches erzählt von der Flucht des Pompeius aus Italien Richtung Griechenland, wo die entscheidende Schlacht bei Pharsalus stattfinden wird (Lucan. 2,725-736). Während der Überfahrt auf dem Adriatischen Meer, die vom Dichter mit den *topoi* des Verbannten beschrieben wird, der sein Land verlässt, schläft Pompeius ein. Die rührende Atmosphäre dieser Zeilen wird von einem bedrohlichen Aufreten des Schattens Julias zerstört, die aus den Eingeweiden der Erde erscheint und dem Ehemann die bevorstehende Niederlage und den Tod voraussagt (Lucan. 3,8-40). Die Julia, die Pompeius im Traum erscheint, ist also anders als die Julia des Proömiums: Ihre Figur nimmt in diesem Traumbild bedrohliche und unheimliche Züge an. Die Traumdarstellung erhält eine signifikante Position im Epos: Sie besiegelt eine Reihe von Misserfolgen des Pompeius und betont seine Flucht aus Italien nach Osten. Bis zu diesem Moment ist Pompeius, gehetzt von Caesar, immer geflohen;[26] die Fortuna hat ihn verlassen, wie der Dichter sagt: *lassata triumphis/descivit Fortuna tuis* (Lucan. 2,727-728).

In diesem Traum stehen die persönlichen Gefühle im Vordergrund, deren Ursachen mit der Geschichte verschmelzen. Julia gibt die folgende Interpretation des Bürgerkriegs: Die Tragödie des *bellum civile* und das Schicksal des Pompeius seien Folgen seiner Ehe mit Cornelia, die kurz nach Julias Tod geschlossen wurde. In diesem Sinn hat die Erscheinung Julias eine ähnliche Funktion wie die Kreusas im zweiten Buch der *Aeneis*. Die Frau des Aeneas tröstet den Gatten und erklärt ihm: *non haec sine numine divom/eveniunt* (Verg. *Aen.* 2,777-778); ihre Trennung sei notwendig, weil er nach Italien gelangen werde, wo er sein Glück und eine neue Gattin, Lavinia, finden werde (vv. 783-784: *illic res laetae regnumque et regia coniunx/parta tibi*). In den Worten Kreusas – deren Leitmotiv die Liebe ist – gibt es also eine Hoffnung auf eine glückliche Zukunft; der Ton der Rede Julias ist ganz anders, weil sie die Trennung nicht akzeptiert und die Niederlage und den Tod Pompeius' voraussagt. Wie es oft in der *Pharsalia* vorkommt, kehrt Lukan das vergilianische Muster um. Aber die *aemulatio* schließt in dieser Szene auch die Figur Didos ein: In der Tat klingt die Drohung Julias, ihren Mann zu verfolgen (Lucan. 3,30-34), wie

26 In Lucan. 1,522 flieht er aus Rom; 2,526-609 versucht er nach der Eroberung der Stadt Capuas, mit einer langen Rede seine Heere zu ermutigen, aber die Soldaten wollen den Kampf vermeiden. Pompeius entscheidet sich dann, nach Brundisium zu flüchten.

der Fluch der karthagischen Königin.[27] Aber es gibt einen wichtigen Unterschied. Dido ist eine verlassene Frau, die wegen ihrer Liebe zu Aeneas die *pietas* ihrem verstorbenen Mann Sichaeus gegenüber gebrochen hat; sie verkörpert den Konflikt zwischen Liebe und Politik, die Unvereinbarkeit von Aeneas' Mission mit seiner Liebe. In der Juliaszene wird die Situation von der Anwesenheit einer anderen Frau erschwert, Cornelia, der fünften Gattin des Pompeius, die zur Rivalin Julias wird. Die Betonung dieser Rivalität und dieses Aspektes der Liebe erklärt die Konzentration elegischer Motive in dieser Szene und die Erinnerung an die Muster der *Elegie* 4,7 des Properz, wo der Schatten der verstorbenen Cynthia dem Dichter im Traum erscheint.[28] Cynthia ist empört über die Anwesenheit einer neuen Frau an seiner Seite und erklärt ihm die ewigen Bande ihrer Liebe: *nunc te possideant aliae: mox sola tenebo:/mecum eris et mixtis ossibus ossa teram* (Prop. 4,7,93-94).

Lesen wir jetzt die lukanische Szene. Julia erzählt ihrem Mann, dass sie nach dem Ausbruch des Krieges von den Elysischen Feldern in den Tartarus versetzt worden sei, und beschreibt kurz das Jenseits. Während der Tartarus seine Tore den zahlreichen Opfern des Krieges öffnet (vv. 11-19), lässt sich Julia ungehalten gegen ihren Mann und dessen neue Frau aus:

Inde soporifero cesserunt languida somno
membra ducis; diri tum plena horroris imago
visa caput maestum per hiantes Iulia terras
tollere et accenso furialis stare sepulchro.
‚Sedibus Elysiis campoque expulsa piorum
ad Stygias' inquit ‚tenebras manesque nocentis
post bellum civile trahor: vidi ipsa tenentis
Eumenidas quaterent quas vestris lampadas armis;
praeparat innumeras puppis Acherontis adusti
portitor; in multas laxantur Tartara poenas;
vix operi cunctae dextra properante sorores
sufficiunt, lassant rumpentis stamina Parcas.
Coniuge me laetos duxisti, Magne, triumphos:
fortuna est mutata toris semperque potentis
detrahere in cladem fato damnata maritos
innupsit tepido paelex Cornelia busto.
Haereat illa tuis per bella, per aequora signis,
dum non securos liceat mihi rumpere somnos

27 Verg. *Aen.* 4,384-387: *sequar atris ignibus absens/et, cum frigida mors anima seduxerit artus,/omnibus umbra locis adero. Dabis, inprobe, poenas;/audiam, et haec Manis veniet mihi fama sub imos.* Siehe Narducci 2002: 287-288.

28 Dies wurde von Hübner 1984 hervorgehoben.

et nullum vestro vacuum sit tempus amori,
sed teneat Caesarque dies et Iulia noctes.
Me non Lethaeae, coniunx, oblivia ripae
inmemorem fecere tui regesque silentum
permisere sequi. Veniam te bella gerente
in medias acies: numquam tibi, Magne, per umbras
perque meos manes genero non esse licebit.
Abscidis frustra ferro tua pignora: bellum
te faciet civile meum'. Sic fata refugit
umbra per amplexus trepidi dilapsa mariti.
(Lucan. 3,8-35)

In den Worten von Julias Schatten dominert die Eifersucht auf die neue Gattin des Pompeius. Dieses Gefühl ist so stark, dass Julia den Bürgerkrieg auf ihre Weise interpretiert: Sie behauptet, das Schicksal Roms sei eng verbunden mit dem Verhältnis zwischen Pompeius und seinen Frauen. Pompeius und dessen Gattin Cornelia seien demnach verantwortlich für dieses tragische Ereignis. Die Ehe mit ihr, Julia, habe dem Feldherrn ermöglicht, in der Gunst der *Venus Victrix* zu stehen, der Schutzgöttin der *gens Iulia*, und somit zahlreiche militärische Erfolge zu erlangen (v. 20: *coniuge me laetos duxisti, Magne, triumphos*). Kurz nach ihrem Tode allerdings, als ihre Asche noch lauwarm gewesen sei (v. 23: *tepido* |...| *busto*), habe Pompeius Cornelia geheiratet, die dazu bestimmt gewesen sei, alle Männer an ihrer Seite in den Ruin zu treiben (v. 22: *detrahere in cladem fato damnata maritos*). Crassus, ihr erster Mann, war in der Tat in Carrhae während der Kampagne gegen die Parther umgekommen, und auch Pompeius geht ihretwegen einem tragischen Tod entgegen.[29] Außerdem bringt Julia Cornelia als nicht *univira* in Verruf und nennt sie mit Verachtung *paelex*, „Konkubine". Dieses Substantiv gehört dem elegischen Wortschatz an[30] und beschreibt eine Geliebte, die ein nicht offiziell geregeltes Verhältnis eingegangen ist. Julia erklärt sich auf diese Weise zur einzig legitimen Frau des Pompeius und schließt ausdrücklich die Frau aus, die ihrer Meinung nach in die Familie eingedrungen ist. Somit verleiht sie ihrem den verzweifelten Willen Ausdruck, vom Jenseits aus ihre Gefühlswelt zu retten. In diesem ‚post-mortalen Konflikt *uxor/paelex*'[31] zeichnet sich also einerseits ein Gegensatz zwischen Glück und Unglück

29 Es ist bemerkenswert, dass Pompeius im zweiten Buch Crassus erwähnt und sich an dessen Tod erinnert: *Parthorum utinam post proelia sospes/et Scythicis Crassus victor remeasset ab oris,/ut simili causa caderes qua Spartacus hostis* (Lucan. 2,552-553). Der Traum könnte also seine Angst widerspiegeln, ebenso wie sein Vorgänger zu enden.

30 z.B. wird in der Klage der ovidianischen *Heroides* die *nova nupta* zur *paelex*.

31 Walde 2001: 395.

des Pompeius ab, der jeweils von Julias und Cornelias Nähe beherrscht wird; andererseits steht dies für die Unsterblichkeit der eigenen Ehe.

Der Schatten droht anschließend Pompeius, ihn zu verfolgen, und erklärt, dass der Gedanke an Caesar ihn alle verbleibenden Tage verfolgen werde, während er in den Nächten verdammt sein werde, an seine verstorbene Gattin zu denken.[32] Julia behauptet, Pompeius nicht vergessen zu haben (vv. 28-29: *me non Letheae, coniunx, oblivia ripae/immemorem fecere tui*) und beharrt auf ihrer Treue gegenüber ihrem Mann, der sich seinerseits aber an eine andere Frau gebunden habe, und das so kurz nach ihrem Tod. Deshalb ist Pompeius schuldig, das *pignus* der Union mit Julia gebrochen zu haben, ein *pignus*, das einen doppelten Wert hat: einerseits Liebespfand und andererseits politisches Bündnis. Es beweist einmal mehr die enge Verbindung zwischen Ehe und politischer Allianz, zwischen Liebe und Geschichte.[33] Aber das Schwert vermag ihre Ehe mit Pompeius nicht auszulöschen: *abscidis frustra ferro tua pignora* (v. 33); ihr Schatten wird ihn bis ans Ende seiner Tage Schwiegersohn von Caesar sein lassen (vv. 31-32: *per umbras/perque meos manes genero non esse licebit*). Der Bürgerkrieg kann also dieses Bündnis nicht trennen, er bietet zudem Julia die Möglichkeit, vom Jenseits aus wieder in den ‚Besitz' ihres Mannes zu gelangen: *bellum/te faciet civile meum* (vv. 33-34). Diese stark elegisch geprägten Worte formulieren unmissverständlich ihren Anspruch auf den Geliebten. Die Unversehrtheit der Union zwischen Julia und Pompeius wird also nur im Tode dank dem Bürgerkrieg wiederhergestellt.

Die Figur der Julia in der *Pharsalia* zeigt also Lukans Fähigkeit, einen Kompromiss zwischen Tradition und Innovation zu finden. Als Garantin der Integrität der Familie und des Staates vereint Julia das sagenhafte Paradigma der Sabinerinnen (wenn auch ins Gegenteil verkehrt) und jenes tragische der Iokaste. Im Traum des Pompeius überträgt Lukan die Geschichte und die Tragödie in die elegische Welt und verwandelt den Bürgerkrieg in eine Auseinandersetzung um Gefühle. In dieser neuen Perspektive ermöglicht paradoxerweise ein Familienkonflikt Julia, ihre Bindung zu Pompeius wiederherzustellen.

---

32 Cornelia wird den Sieg Julias in diesem Konflikt im achten Buch nach der Niederlage des Pompeius anerkennen und sogar ihre eigene Rolle als *paelex* akzeptieren: *ubicumque iaces civilibus armis/nostros ulta toros, ades huc atque exige poenas,/Iulia crudelis, placataque paelice caesa/Magno parce tuo* (Lucan. 8,102-105). Sie wird außerdem anerkennen, dass sie am Tod ihrer beiden Männer schuld ist: *Bis nocui mundo: me pronuba ducit Erinys/Crassorumque umbrae devotaque manibus illis/Assyrios in castra tuli civilia casus/praecipitesque dedi populos cunctosque fugavi/a causa meliore deos* (Lucan. 8,94-98).

33 Vgl. Walde 2001: 394 Fn. 18.

Caesar's Voice and Caesarian Voices

ELAINE FANTHAM

1. Introductory

Each time I return to Lucan's civil war narrative, I become more aware of its idiosyncrasies. And though wise and learned scholars have uncovered many aspects of his reporting, I continue to find other anomalies unanalysed and other questions unasked. My focus in this paper is rhetorical: on the situations in which Caesar is presented, the interlocutors with whom he makes contact, and the effects Lucan achieves by his selection of these contexts. As preliminaries however, I would like to recall two aspects of character presentation which I believe should be taken into account in interpreting the narrative of historical epic.

The first is an underlying element in both characterization and moral evaluation: the Panaetian theory of the four *personae*, which as Cicero knew, defined the personality of fictional persons in epic and tragedy, and served as a tool for readers to determine the moral propriety of each individual's behaviour. These four *personae* are grouped by Cicero in two pairs: first that of the reasoning being which enables a person to follow what is right and honourable (*off.* 1.107) and the individual mentality which varies from one person to another within the patterns of proper behaviour (1.108-110 *tenenda sunt sua cuique non vitiosa sed tamen propria, quo facilius decorum illud* [...] *retineatur.*) Added to this are the third *persona* (1.115) imposed on the individual by circumstance (*casus aliqui aut tempus*) and the fourth, proceeding from his own inheritance or choice of life-style or career (*quam nobismet ipsi iudicio nostro accommodamus*). The fourth persona is defined by the behaviour and *officia* expected from a man young or old, healthy or invalid, holding office or private, nobly born or plebeian (1.116-117, 122-125) – we might add soldier and civilian.

Different behaviour is appropriate to different men, and it was Cato's persona which made it right for him to commit suicide rather than surrender to Caesar, whereas surrender was acceptable for others (1.112, a point

made also by Seneca[1]). Keeping this in mind can help us to understand apparent inconsistencies in Lucan's judgment of characters in the different worlds of an army or the senate. One theme I shall pursue is to examine who interacts with Caesar and how we should judge both their claims and their behaviour.

The second approach is one I learnt from Heinze's[2] chapter on the speeches of the *Aeneid*, developed by Denis Feeney 1983 in the second part of a fine paper which showed by analysis of Aeneas' interactions how often his speech was neither an answer to other persons nor answered by them: the speeches occur in a near vacuum, resulting in further action without acknowledgement. While Caesar's personality is very far from that of his great Trojan ancestor, his situation is not unlike that of Aeneas: first and foremost because he is not just a leader but the only leader of the forces with whom he chiefly interacts. When Caesar speaks, his audience do not reply, they obey!

You may not have noticed, but (in contrast with Caesar's reports in his *Civil War* of repeated attempts to negotiate with the Pompeians) Caesar rarely comes face to face with anyone of his own class. The exceptions are Curio (whom he does not answer), Domitius Ahenobarbus (twice), and the Metellus who tries to bar him from emptying the state treasury in book 3. Caesar's curt and contemptuous address to Metellus packs four insults into seven lines:

vanam spem *mortis honestae*
concipis: haud ... iugulo se polluet isto
nostra, Metelle, manus. dignum te Caesaris ira
nullus honor faciet. te vindice tuta relicta est
Libertas? non usque adeo permiscuit imis
longus summa dies ut non, si voce Metelli
servantur *lege.s*, malint a Caesare tolli
(3.134-140)[3]

The double naming of his opponent is itself insulting, reinforcing Caesar's sarcastic iteration of four of the aristocratic code values: *mors honesta*, *honor*, *Libertas*[4] and *Lege.s*. To Domitius he addresses all of eight words in book 2; *vive, licet nolis, et nostro munere* [...] / *cerne diem*, (backed by a public declaration of his much advertised *clementia*: 2.512-515); while at

1 Sen. *epist.* 82.12-13: why suicide was proper for Cato but not for lesser men. Cf. also *epist.* 95.71

2 Heinze 1915, tr. 1993

3 All quotations of Lucan are taken from Shackleton-Bailey 1988.

4 *Libertas* in particular is used with different reference by both Caesarians and republican ideologues like Cato (2.304; 9.193, 205, 265).

Domitius's imagined death-scene in mid-battle he lavishes eleven words: *iam Magni deseris arma/successor Domiti; sine te iam bella geruntur* (7.606-607). When the military man (and ex consul) Afranius makes an abject surrender (4.344-362) asking only for his force to retire from all warfare, Lucan does not give Caesar's words, but affirms his consent: *Caesar facilis vultuque serenus/flectitur atque usu belli poenamque remittit* (363-364).

Pompey is given a human face by the scenes with his beloved wife, but has no interaction with his fellow senators (many of them related by blood or marriage) until he is unhistorically rebuked by Cicero on the eve of Pharsalus (7.68-85).[5] Lucan may have conceived this as a public rebuke in a *contio*, and Pompey's words may be a public reply, but it seems unlikely: if this is a *contio*, his words quickly become an apostrophe, first to Rome (7.91) then a reproach against Fortuna (110), and Caesar himself (113). as happened before, in his unhappy address to the soldiers in 2.531-595.[6] Pompey will speak once again after his defeat when his disloyal plan to ally with Rome's enemies, the Parthians, (8.161-327) provokes a hostile muttering (*murmure sentit/consilium damnasse viros*) and is overruled by Lentulus. Lucan's Pompey is true to the sad picture given by Cicero's letters of a disastrous public speaker.

Instead let us focus on Caesar and his world, one consisting almost exclusively of his own forces. All Roman soldiers bound themselves by *sacramentum* to their commanders, though this oath is named only once in Lucan's epic, at 4.229, when the Pompeian legate Petreius, sarcastically mentions the oath binding Caesar's rebel troops to their commander. Certainly the new conditions of service by unpropertied soldiers in the post-Marian army had increased the indebtedness of soldiers to their commander not only for spoils won in battle but for any kind of land settlement to serve as their pension in retirement. Caesar reminds his men of this in 1.343-345. But Caesar in Lucan reflects the hero of his own war dispatches, acknowledging, naming, and praising his centurions, even though metre prohibits using this title: Laelius is *summi tum munera pili /|...| emeritique gerens insignia doni* (1.365-366); if Vulteius is simply *dux carinae* (4.540), Scaeva earns more detail: *sanguine multo/promotus Latiam longo ferit ordine vitem* (6.145-146), Crastinus, to whom Caesar paid warmest tribute in his *bellum Civile*, is addressed by Lucan in a very dif-

5 Cicero was never at Pharsalus, but stayed with the garrison at Dyrrhachium until after the battle.

6 In 2.531f., Pompey turns to Caesar as early as 544 and stays with him until 559, then again from 566-575. This was my reaction fifteen years ago (Fantham 1992) when commenting on book 2; now however I see that Pompey's obsession with Caesar only mirrors on a larger scale Caesar's own preoccupation with Pompey in the first speech to his soldiers. See further p. 60 below.

ferent spirit, blamed for casting the first spear that stains Thessaly with Roman blood (7.471-473).[7] The centurions were as much the general's intermediaries with his foot-soldiers as the soldiers' mouthpieces to their general.[8]

Even allowing for Caesar's own sanitized reports of his campaigns, Lucan preserves, especially in the Spanish campaign of book 4, much of the enthusiasm with which Caesar credited his soldiers and the mutual goodwill between the commander and his force: compare Caesar *civ.* 1.64.2:

> totis vero castris milites circulari et dolere hostium ex manibus dimitti, bellum necessario longius duci, centurionesque tribunosque militum adire atque obsecrare ut per eos Caesar certior fieret ne labori suo neu periculo parceret. paratos esse ses posse et audere [...] transire flumen

or 1.72.2-3:

> cur etiam secundo proelio aliquos ex suis amitteret? cur volnerari peteretur optime meritis de se milites? cur denique fortunam periclitaretur? [...] movebatur etiam misericordia civium quos interficiendos videbat; quibus salvis atque incolumibus rem optinere malebat.

Caesar is most vivid in his direct dealings with his soldiers, and the exchanges between general and foot-soldiers offer the high points in the books leading up to his victory at Pharsalus. The sense of continuity is increased by Lucan's choice not to identify specific legions – a feature which would make awkward poetry, but also serves to give the impression that even confronting the mutiny at Placentia Caesar is dealing with the same troops we have already met. But before the first scene between commander and army Lucan must frame the moment of invasion, the moment when Caesar will ask his city to give backing to his new undertaking (*Roma, fave coeptis* 1.200). Caesar himself began his detailed account when he received the fugitive tribunes at Ravenna, inside his province, before he initiated the fatal march to Ariminum. Lucan starts later, leaping past Ravenna, and instead marks the crossing of the Rubicon with the only supernatural opposition that Caesar will meet, as *Patria* confronts him in fear and mourning. Her protest is that as citizens they can go no further according to the law: *si iure venitis/si cives, huc usque licet!* But Lucan gives Caesar a powerful reply, invoking gods which would surely suggest Virgil's original appeal in *Georgics* I for divine support of Caesar's son, Rome's youthful saviour. Virgil appeals to *Di patrii indigites, et Romule,*

7 Contrast Caesar's praise at Lucan. 3.91 and 99.

8 See Getty 1940 on 356, citing Lejay 1894 and Caesar *Gall.* 1.41.3 and 7.17.8.

Vestaque mater/quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas (*georg.* 1.498-9).

Caesar appeals not only to Rome's founding gods, but to the gentile gods of the Iulii: to Jupiter Tonans, to the Penates of his ancestral Troy, and the *secreta* of deified Quirinus, to Jupiter Latiaris of Alba (the home of the Iulii), to Vesta's hearth, and Rome, equal to the highest divinity (*summi numinis instar*): he has returned as victor over foreign enemies and fights now as Rome's own soldier, if he is only permitted. The guilt lies not with him but with the rival who has made him Rome's enemy: *qui me tibi fecerit hostem* – but not made me become your active enemy; rather made me, declared me, to be a public enemy.[9]

I see no merit in hypothesizing what details may have stood in Livy's lost civil war books, and the periochae give little help. To avoid using Caesar's own self-interested narrative as a basis for judging Lucan's modifications, I have resorted to Appian's account, which is usually believed to depend on Pollio who was with Caesar in the war.[10] According to Appian's detailed report (*B.C.* 2.33-38) Curio came first to Caesar in December, and was sent back to Rome with a peace proposal reaching the city in three days, and returned only when he accompanied the new tribunes expelled from the senate. In Appian Ravenna is not named, but Caesar welcomes the tribunes and displays them to his forces before sending a contingent of his force ahead to occupy Ariminum by night, and take up their station in the public forum: so the tribunes must have reached him at Ravenna. Caesar himself followed on later that night, arriving at daybreak.

2. Lucan's Caesar at Ariminum

Lucan claims that Fortune favoured Caesar by giving him the constitutionally just cause of avenging the abuse to the tribunes (Antonius and Cassius, still technically in office) expelled by the senate for their dissidence (*discordes* 1.266). If they had come to him when still in his province at Ravenna, this would certainly have provided a just cause for action on his part. But in Lucan's narrative they join him at Ariminum, bringing with them the ex-tribune Curio.[11] Lucan has suppressed Curio's first visit

9 Caesar was declared a public enemy by the Senate's emergency decree of 7 January, 49.

10 Plutarch's *Caesar* also uses Pollio's lost histories, but Plutarch's format as a biographer does not require him to provide full or chronologically ordered information.

11 This corresponds to Curio's second journey, though Curio's speech could be seen as matching his first encounter with Caesar.

(in December 50) transferring its content to this later occasion in January 49.

Curio is the first person of Caesar's own class to speak to him in the poetic narrative, and Curio is discredited in advance by his description *audax venali |...| Curio lingua*, a man who once spoke for the people and defended its liberty, setting the men of power against the common people.[12] Both here and more explicitly in his necrology for the dead commander in 4.799-824 Lucan accuses Curio of being bought by Caesar. In 4.799-802 he is reproached with disrupting speech from the *rostra* and arming the common people, with betraying the senate and ordering Caesar and Pompey to fight. But later Curio receives some strangely unwarranted praise: "Rome scarcely gave birth to any citizen of such personality, or to whom the laws owed more, while he followed the right cause" (814-15).[13] His corruption follows and is presented as a turning point, when he was bought by Caesar's Gallic gold: *momentumque fuit mutatus Curio rerum/Gallorum captus spoliis et Caesaris auro* (4.819-820): in the last line of the book the man introduced in book 1 as *venalis* is dismissed for selling his own city: *hic vendidit urbem* (4.824).

But does the allusion to his venality mean that his speech is false? None of it is contrary to the evidence of e.g. Caelius' letters to Cicero.[14] He claims that he defended and tried to extend Caesar's command as long as he had the tribune's status; that the decree of emergency had silenced the laws, and he will depend on Caesar's victory to make him once again a citizen. Caesar is depriving himself of the triumph that is his right (1.283-287) and Pompey has resolved to drive him off from their autocracy (*socerum depellere regno/decretum genero est.*) Like Caesar to *Patria*, Curio puts the appearance of justice on his claim, and gives high honour to the concept of citizenship (Curio too had probably been declared a *hostis*), but the suggestion of usurping the monopoly of *regnum* contradicts any pretence of legality and concern for justice.

---

12 On Curio see Ahl 1976: ch. 3.

13 Curio had certainly once been a conservative but there is no record of any laws, salutary or otherwise, that he had proposed: indeed he had been a close ally of the radical Clodius until his death in 52. Cicero could still write encouraging letters to him from Cilicia, hoping that he would use his newly won tribunate as a force for good (but perhaps fearing Curio's indebtedness and Caesar's generosity). Viewing the situation in 50 impartially Curio's tribunician proposal that both Caesar and Pompey go to their provinces was common sense, and on overwhelming approval in the senate, but it was vetoed by the pressure of the ultra conservatives around Pompey.

14 Caelius, Curio's friend, wrote about a dozen letters to Cicero during his governorship of Cilicia from mid 51 to mid-50 BCE, including details of all senatorial debates.

Lucan claims that Curio added force and anger to Caesar, *in bellum prono*, as applause inflames a race-horse at the gates. But Caesar surely did not need Curio to prompt him to the next step, of summoning his force and addressing them. We may wonder whether Curio's prominence is not serving other purposes: to discredit Caesar by the company he keeps, or structurally, to provide a foreshadowing for the young officer's ignominious suicide in Africa. What follows is Caesar's first exchange with his soldiers as he prompts them to invading their country in open civil war. If we are to grasp how Lucan portrays Caesarians, we should review this scene between the general and his soldiers in detail.

I know of only two discussions of Caesarians and Pompeians and the attitudes which Lucan assigns to them: Jacqueline Brisset's *Les idées politiques de Lucain*, 1964 which considers each of these groups in turn along with their leaders, and Matthew Roller's discussion in *Constructing Autocracy* 1993. Since I have found Roller's account particularly good to argue with, let me quote his introductory summary of Lucan's treatment:

> When Caesar takes up arms against the state, he creates a community of supporters who largely regard other Romans as enemies rather than as fellow-citizens, and who deploy ethical language accordingly (e.g. it is right and proper to use violence against them). On the other hand the Pompeians generally regard their Caesarian opponents as fellow-citizens, which renders the use of violence against them problematic if not impossible.[15]

Later in his analysis of Lucan Roller distinguishes between an assimilationist point of view, which sees the opposite side as fellow-citizens, and the alienating viewpoint in which those fighting against them are *hostes* rather than *cives*. The distinction is important and we should not let any use of either *hostis* or *civis* go unexamined. I have reservations about Roller's portrayal of the Pompeians as assimilationist, which rests entirely on the words of Pompey himself, although our sources all bring out the divergence of attitudes between the general and his assertive elite officers (senators who saw themselves as colleagues, not subordinates). But I would also stress from the beginning that while Caesar's supporters are shown as his junior officers, centurions and legionaries, drawn from the notional *Populus Romanus*, Pompey's side seems to consist only of senators and foreign auxiliary forces, with no allusion to any legions under his command except for the two legions borrowed and returned by Caesar, who failed at Corfinium and will again fail Curio in Africa. Pompey does not, ostensibly, relate to the army of the Roman people.

15 Roller 1993: 11.

In Lucan's narrative Caesar has to inspire his soldiers to invade their own country – but if they are at Ariminum they have already done so. Before evaluating his speech I must retract or at least modify the criticism I made of Pompey's first unsuccessful speech in my earlier commentary on book 2. For if Pompey commits a rhetorical error in devoting large sections of his speech to the soldiers to abusing Caesar (all of 2.544-559 is actually addressed to Caesar: compare 575 *heu demens, non te fugiunt, me cuncta sequuntur*). Caesar devotes an equal part of his almost equally long speech (53 lines as opposed to Pompey's 64) to denouncing Pompey (1.311-326): each man is obsessed with his rival. One difference is that Caesar keeps Pompey in the third person until 330-331, *sic et Sullanum solitum tibi lambere ferrum/durat, Magne, sitis, cf. Ille tuus Sulla*, 335 and *Magne*, 346. Indeed the speeches are made to parallel each other in another conspicuous respect: Caesar's comparison of Pompey with tigers or their cubs 327-329 *utque ferae tigres numquam posuere furorem/quas nemore Hyrcano matrum dum lustra secuntur/altus caesorum pavit cruor armentorum*, will echo in Pompey's accusation of rabies (2.535 and 544) and 536 *iam tetigit sanguis pollutos Caesaris enses.*[16]

This speech,[17] especially its lurid epic tiger-simile, is far from the known rhetoric of Caesar as commander, but Lucan has another agenda: The speeches have been crafted to serve as a pair: but this is only half the truth. If Caesar's men are initially hesitant *dubium iam claro murmure vulgus/secum incerta fremit* (1.352-353), Pompey's men hear him in stony silence *nullo partes clamore secuntur*, 2.596. So how has Lucan given Caesar a better outcome? Firstly by constructing into his speech concern for the soldiers and their interests: they are his partners in war – *bellorum O socii*; they have shared hardships with him, and the present situation is seen as an injustice to them (*hoc |...| meruit?*) and a harsh judgment upon them as if they were Hannibal. If he had been defeated, Gallic hordes would have poured down upon Italy. Pompey's soldiers are makeshift (*milite cum subito*) and his supporters civilians (*partesque in bella togatae*) great talkers (*Marcellus |...| loquax*) backed by remote and bribed foreign clients: Rome itself has been oppressed by Pompey's soldiers (1.319-323, a situation which might have failed to shock Caesar's hardened veterans). Pompey has been enjoying an uninterrupted tyranny (*continuo per tot satiabunt tempora regno* 315: cf. *Quem tamen inveniet*

16 One curious difference lies in Lucan's two allusions to Milo's trial; in 1.323 Caesar calls him a victim of Pompeian military intimidation; but in 2.480, the poet himself transfers the guilt to Milo, calling the same soldiers *oppositus quondam polluto tiro Miloni.*

17 I have discussed the few attested excerpts of Caesar's oratory cited in Malcovati *ORF* ed. 4 in Griffin 2009.

tam longa potentia finem? |...| *ex hoc* |...| *regno/ille tuus saltem doceat descendere Sulla* 333-335).

But Caesar has not forgotten his audience and at 340 he turns to the rewards so far denied to his men (341). What lands will the authorities give to his men to farm, when Pompey has lavished land on conquered eastern pirates (343-346)? Jealousy will do the trick. His men and his army have been victorious and now they must use their strength, since they have been denied their just reward (*arma tenenti/omnia dat qui iusta negat* 348f.).

Yet the men still waver, until the centurion Laelius speaks up. Is this man historical? Caesar's other centurions are vouched for in his text, but only one contemporary Laelius is known and he is D. Laelius, a Pompeian. The Laelius-figure must surely be historical, like the otherwise unattested Cotta (probably a tribune, so MRR II on 49 BC) who silences the protesting Metellus in front of the Roman treasury. The difference is that there were many Aurelii Cottae, and since Caesar's mother was an Aurelia, it is not difficult to assume a relatively unknown Cotta acting in support of Caesar. But with up to sixty centurions in a legion, why should history have commemorated this Laelius? Is it too good to be true that this man who will advocate ruthless bloodshed has won the civic crown (1.358) for saving a citizen's life? His speech is half the length of Caesar's and opens with an extraordinary title: *Romani maxime rector/nominis*.[18] But there are signals that the speech is flattery in the best tradition of the Neronian senate: Laelius is a Yes-man. He insists his words are *verae ... voces*, and reproaches Caesar with too much patience. He preempts his fellow soldiers by announcing their indignation (*conquerimur*), and picks up Caesar's abuse of the civilian senate from (*degeneremque* |...| *togam, regnumque senatus*, cf. 311-312, 315 and 336). With unabashed hyperbole he vows support if Caesar leads them to the extremes of earth, Scythia and the Libyan Syrtes,[19] since they have already conquered the Ocean and the Rhine. He, and supposedly they, must and will carry out Caesar's

18 *Rector* itself is common in Lucan and used of ordinary steersmen and (twice) of Pompey, as well as for Jupiter as *rector Olympi* But even qualified with *maxime* it is mild when contrasted with Lucan's extended use of *domitor*, a more extreme and tyrannical designation. One of his four instances is literal, of a horse-tamer, echoing Virgil's repeated designation *Messapus equum domitor*, and the sole instance in Ovid. But Caesar's use of *domitor mundi* to address his soldiers in 7.250 is matched only by Lucan's personal allusion to Pompey as failing to be *domitor mundi* (8.553) and the Egyptian courtier's address to Caesar in 9.1014.

19 Cf. the protests of Catullus' false friends in poem 11.1-8, the Libyan and Scythian climatic extremes of *Georgics* 3.339 (*Pastores Libyae*), and 349 (*Scythiae gentes*): so also Horace *Odes* 1.22.5-8 (*Syrtes* |...| *inhospitalem Caucasum*).

orders,[20] and treat anyone who opposes his battle signal as an enemy, a non-citizen *nec civis meus est, in quem tua classica, Caesar/audiero* (373-374). This simple language carries a load of ideology, which will be recalled by inversion when Caesar at Pharsalus declares that whatever man among the opposing forces flees from the battle is a fellow-citizen (*civis, qui fugerit, esto* 7.319). Now however Laelius deliriously swears by Caesar's standards and the triumphs he has earned to slay his brother and father, and his pregnant wife, even against his physical instinct (*invita* |...| *dextra*), to rob the gods and set fire to their temples, even to set up a mint to make melted divine statues into bullion for the soldiers' pay (something Caesar will avoid only by emptying the state treasury in book 3): he will camp on the Tiber banks and confiscate Italian farmland (*Hesperios* |...| *veniam metator in agros*) battering down city walls, even if the city he destroys is Rome. And the last words are *Roma sit* 386.

We will meet two more instances of this fanatical loyalty in Vulteius (book 4) and Scaeva (book 6): here, as in book 4, it is infectious and Caesar's troops endorse Laelius' words, promising their action in whatever war Caesar will lead them. Their shouts are as loud as the groaning forests bent down and forced back to the skies by the North wind.[21] Now the soldiers are as eager for war as Caesar (*acceptum tam prono milite bellum* 392 = *ipsi/in bellum prono* 291f.).

3. Episodes of Military Conflict

While Caesar is most himself when engaging with his soldiers, he does not have a monopoly of military scenes. If we never see Pompey or his elite senatorial associates in a proper military context, we do have an opportunity to measure Pompeians and their commanders in the extraordinary crisis of fraternization and surrender in Spain. Here are two 'Pompeians' who are also career military men, Afranius, whom Pompey financed to hold the consulship of 60 BCE and the older Petreius,[22] who did not advance beyond praetor. Lucan describes them as sharing command in harmony,

20 This is the best translation I can offer for 1.372 *iussa sequi tam posse mihi quam velle necesse est.*

21 Caesar compares himself to the wind which feeds on resistance to keep up its force at 3.361-5 *Ventus ut amittit vires, nisi robore densae/occurrunt silvae, spatio diffusus inani,/utque perit magnus nullis obstantibus ignis,/sic hostes mihi desse nocet.*

22 Broughton (1951= MRR II) calls Petreius praetor before 63, but adds that his career began as early as 92. If he was 17 in 92 this would make him older than Cicero.

but they will be represented by all our sources as different in attitude.[23] And here too Lucan approaches the behaviour of common soldiers in an extraordinary episode of fraternization. As Appian (*B.C.* 2.42-44) and Caesar in greater detail (*civ.* 1.73-86) both show, the commanders did not agree on resistance, nor it seems (Caesar *civ.* 1.74) did the common soldiers and their tribunes and centurions.

According to Appian one of Afranius' and Petreius' divisions was surprised by Caesar but allowed to go free, leading to the fraternization between the adjacent camps "and talk of reconciliation between the rank and file." (Appian *B.C.* 2.42 end). It is this which is so movingly described by Lucan in 4.169-204. But this sequence shows no favour to the Pompeians. Instead it reiterates the overrriding principle that all slaughter of fellow citizens is *nefas* (205), a *nefas* made worse because in the slack period of unofficial truce the soldiers were freely passing between the camps in search of guest-friends, kinsmen, and former classmates (177-78) and enjoying Peace (196, cf. 210), sharing meals and libations, with turf altars, passing the sleepless nights in mutual reminiscence. Lucan makes much of the renewal of loyalty which would only intensify the guilt of any bloodshed (*est miseris renovata fides* 204).

Appian reports (*B.C.* 2.43) that Afranius and other officers now thought it best to withdraw, abandoning Spain to Caesar, provided they could rejoin Pompey. It is Petreius, not Caesar, who serves as villain in this narrative, and Lucan adds colour, depicting him as striding into camp to fight criminal skirmishes with a band of personal slaves (*famulas* [...] *dextras*, cf. 218), driving unarmed Caesarians from the camp with bloodshed, and speaking in violent anger. In Petreius' speech the soldiery are betraying their country and the senate's cause, ready to beg Caesar as *dominus* to accept them as slaves and pardon their leaders. Petreius bandies the name of *Libertas*, but in a suspect context – what was, he asks, the point of discovering metal and armaments if it was ever right to exchange Liberty for peace (222-227)? He deprecates the military oaths binding Caesar's men to him (*sacramenta* [...] *sceleri iurata nefando*), and accuses them of sacrificing their own *fides* in hope of pardon.

Perhaps this is the time to ask about the legitimacy of both armies. Afranius and Petreius were legates chosen by Pompey as part of the command in hither Spain which he accepted by the *Lex Trebonia* of 55, as was his right. What was abnormal, but seems to have violated no formal rule, was his own decision to stay at Rome, leaving Spain to be governed

23 Lucan. 4.2-4 *iure pari rector castris Afranius ille/Ac Petreius erat: concordia duxit in aequas/Imperium commune vices.* For a recent analysis of these phrases (and a discussion of the whole Ilerda campaign) see Masters 1992: 43-45, and chapter 3.

by these *legati*. Caesar's own forces had been drafted by him during his first and renewed commands in Gaul between 58 and 50: their oaths still bound them to him. But neither he nor his troops had any right to be in Spain, no more right than he had enjoyed to enter Italy. By Sulla's *lex Cornelia de maiestate*, no provincial governor could leave the boundaries of his province without senatorial authorization. But Lucan is operating with a higher standard, the avoidance of civil bloodshed. So now Petreius' men are reinspired with the love of crime, and compared to wild beasts roused by the taste of blood; the old vocabulary of bestial *rabies* returns with a full reprise of the triumvirs' mutual abuse:

ferae |...|
|...| si torrida parvus
venit in ora cruor, redeunt rabiesque furorque, 240
admonitaeque tument gustato sanguine fauces.[24]
(4.238-241)

The *fides* Petreius boasted performs monstrous acts of slaughter, slaying breasts these men had just recently embraced (4.209, 245-246).

It is left to Caesar to be merciful, to hold back his soldiers in an action which Lucan hails as transforming his own cause into that of justice: *hoc siquidem solo civilis crimine belli/dux causae melioris eris* (258f.). After the Pompeians have trapped themselves in an untenable and waterless position Afranius is sent to beg surrender. Lucan shows his approval by the insistence that this pleader for mercy preserved his dignity (*servata precanti/maiestas* (340-341) and he invokes Caesar's own greatness as his cause for hope: *At nunc causa mihi est orandae sola salutis/dignum donanda, Caesar te credere vita* (4.346-347).

For his soldiers he asks only their discharge from the civil conflict. We will learn from Caesar's continuators that both Afranius and Petreius joined Pompey in Greece and even Pompey's successors in Africa. Caesar grants their men retirement from action and Lucan himself heralds their retirement with an envious blessing (384-401) with wives and children in a cottage far from battle calls, and the right to speak impartially of both leaders: "This one |Caesar| was author and origin of my survival, the other was once my leader."

Book 4 leaves Caesar but not his supporters, to whom we will return. I would like just briefly to recall from book 5 the case against Caesar made by the spokesmen of the unlocated mutiny by his unidentified soldiers, corresponding to the mutiny at Placentia in Appian *B.C.* 2.47. I have written enough about this in an earlier article[25] but would like simply to

24 Cf 1.327-332 and 2.536, 544 discussed above.

25 Fantham 1985: 119-31.

add that while the soldiers' grievances are predictable, protesting against unending campaigns on ever changing fronts. with all the guilt of civil war but without the reward of triumph or plunder (269-273) this time Lucan blames Caesar for the thirst for blood and battle when even his soldiers are sated. His claim that he does not need them but can find better soldiers who will triumph while they must watch as humble civilians is in keeping with a new level of arrogance, recognizable even in the third book. There we have his legitimate contempt for Metellus, his refusal of neutrality to the Massilians when they offer to mediate (probably a shrewd decision on his part) and his hubris in swinging his axe to fell the sacred grove; 3.437 *credite me fecisse nefas*, suffering no punishment for his violation of the (foreign) gods.[26]

Caesar will parade the same contempt for gods as well as men when he follows this mutiny with the crazy attempt to cross to Brundisium from the mouth of the Aous river in Epirus (5.476-677). He told the mutineers that the gods were indifferent to them, and cared only for a few great men like himself:

> numquam sic cura deorum
> se premet ut vestrae morti vestraeque saluti
> fata vacent: procerum motus haec cuncta secuntur;
> humanum paucis vivit genus
>
> (5.340-343)

His soliloquy apostrophizing Antonius damns him for a coward, holding back the gods and destiny (488, 481f.).To the fisherman Amyclas he declares that the gods will never desert himself (581f.). Fortune is using this storm of sea and sky to serve his needs(592f.); only after Lucan's full-blown hurricane is Caesar convinced that the dangers are worthy of his fate (*credit iam digna pericula Caesar/fatis esse suis* (653f.). And it is worth noticing that his force is desolate at his disappearance (5.682-699), rightly protesting that their fate depends on his survival, while he is wearying the Fates and Fortune when he should be aiming to become ruler of the world and master of empire (*rector |...| orbis, dominus rerum*). So far Caesar has flouted man and god without retaliation. But his career and his role in the poem will change after Pharsalus. After that criminal victory he is isolated, visiting Troy as it seems alone, confronting the treacherous Ptolemy and his servants alone, and visiting the tomb of his predecessor Alexander alone. We will see him at the banquet with Cleopatra and engaging with the wise man Acoreus, but we will not see him in interaction with either his soldiers or his Roman fellow aristocrats again.

26 Cf. 4.448, and Fantham 1996.

4. Fanaticism and the Individual Caesarian (Vulteius and Scaeva)

It is customary to discuss those two extremists, Vulteius, commander of the Opitergini, and Scaeva the centurion, together, as if they exemplified the same pattern of Caesarian loyalty.[27] But they are often considered without comparing their earlier context. Scaeva is indeed a fanatical Caesarian and we will come back to him. But Vulteius is more of a mystery. He is commanding Gauls, but is not a Gaul, as Ahl assumes, but a Roman *tribunus militum*.[28] His force had already a role in the eloquence of the *suasoria*, as Quintilian shows (3.8.23 and 30). Quintilian first lists the rubrics of honour, expediency and necessity, but deprecates the last as an issue, since there is usually the alternative of death.

> If a besieged garrison, outnumbered and short of water and food, discusses surrendering to the enemy, and this is said to be 'necessary' it follows of course that one must understand, 'otherwise we die', the situation itself does not make surrender 'necessary', because it is open to them to die. The Saguntines did not surrender, nor did the men from Opitergium who were surrounded on the raft [...]
> (30) Often indeed we say that expediency must be spurned so that we can act honourably (as indeed when we advise the men of Opitergium not to surrender, though they will die unless they do so.
>
> (Quintilian *inst.* 2.8.23, 30 tr. Russell)

This story is not found in Caesar, but both Quintilian and Florus (2.13.32-3) probably drew it from the lost books of Livy. Let us assume Lucan too found it in Livy's narrative. Certainly he prefaces the showpiece harangue of their commander with a highly detailed account of the makeshift covered raft, carried by the current and trapped by chains stretched across the inlet by Cilician divers, until it was surrounded by Pompeian enemies both on shore and across the water. Night has stopped play (to use a cricketing term) and they must decide – what? Not to surrender, but to die honorably as free men – this is the premise of Vulteius' harangue. In Lucan's narrative when dawn came they fought fiercely (4.529-538: presumably by casting their spears at long distance?) until they decided it was time to die. So why could they not simply have fought on to the death? Instead their leader assumes that self-chosen death is their only option, adding that glory is not diminished by bringing on one's own death *admoto occurrere fato* (480). His entire extended speech is obsessed with choosing one's own death.[29] Once his men resolve on death they

27 So for example Ahl 1976: 117-121.

28 He is called *tribunus* in the detailed report by Florus 2.13.32-33, and commands a cohort in Lucan.

29 The classic study of this episode is Rutz 1960.

have nothing to fear. But wouldn't this be true if they resolved simply to fight the enemy to the death? Why does he need to propose mutual suicide? The answer seems to be what Brutus had previously argued to Cato: one must not waste one's death unseen: Cato's spear-shots must not be lost in a blind cloud of weapons (*nec pila lacertis/missa tuis caeca telorum in nube ferentur* 2.262) and he himself wants to become an *exemplum* by a kind of non-combatant *devotio* (2.307-315). So Vulteius urges his men *nec tamen in caeca bellorum nube cadendum est* (4.488). This is a waste of death. Instead the gods have set them in full view in their *conspicua carina*, with many witnesses (*testes*), so as to be a memorable example[30] added to the records of loyalty in history (*quaecumque per aevum/exhibuit monimenta fides* 496-499). This is a debate about choosing a glorious death, and Caesar is only marginal to this resolve: *namque suis pro te gladiis incumbere, Caesar, esse parum scimus* (500-501). There is of course, the risk that the enemy will humiliate them by sparing their lives, but this too is turned into a plus in the calculus of death, and will only be worthwhile if the enemy has to watch them kill themselves and should not think this a counsel of despair. This is a weak point in his argument, so Vulteius quickly returns to treating their behaviour as service to Caesar: only great *virtus* will deserve to be treated by Caesar as a real loss. Vulteius claims to be so inflamed by zeal for death that he has already thrown away his life.

The harangue is over, but Lucan is still only half way through his narrative and has to restart when the Opitergini grow tired of killing the enemy. A second speech is needed, so Vulteius as *dux* [...] *carinae* bares his throat and invites any friend to kill him and so guarantee his own death with Vulteius' last living blow (540-547). If Lucan wants us to admire this single-minded folly, he chooses the wrong analogies when he compares the Opitergini to the Spartoi of Thebes and the dragon's teeth men sown by Jason at Colchis (549-556), and concludes (557-558) that death has the smallest part of *virtus* in the deaths of these men.[31] Lucan has invoked virtus four times in this episodes; twice in Vulteius' speech (491, 512): this is the third instance, and the fourth comes as Lucan looks forward to *Fama* (574) and the lesson that it is no demanding form of *virtus* to escape slavery by one's own action: "swords were given not to destroy others but to save any man from enslavement."(579) *Sed quid hoc ad Caesarem?*

30 While Florus omits the renewed fighting after dawn, he agrees with Lucan (and a common source such as the lost Livy?) about the ethos of their actions (*memorandum* [...] *exemplum* [...] *cum exitum virtus non haberet*).

31 4.558. This rather oracular utterance is explained by Duff: suffering death actually required less courage than inflicting it.

Scaeva is a more straightforward case. Caesar himself reported that every soldier took wounds in the castellum Minucii, and his men brought back about 30,000 arrows, including a hundred and twenty arrow holes in the shield of Scaeva the centurion

> quem Caesar ut erat de se meritus et de re publica donatum milibus CC*** atque ab octavis ordinibus ad primum pilum se traducere pronuntiavit – eius enim ope castellum magna ex parte conservatum esse constabat.
>
> (Caes. *civ.* 3.5)

In this episode too Lucan offers two animal similes, comparing Scaeva to an elephant (208-213) and a bear (220-223). Although the episode fulfils a similar function to that of Vulteius and occupies the same space, Scaeva is a man of action and needs only fifteen lines to rally his men (150-165). He invokes Caesar in his first words (*quo vos pavor* |...| *adegit/impius et cunctis ignotus Caesaris armis?*) including two more references to Caesar whom he would have desired as witness (159) but whose distant ears the din of their heroic battle will reach (162f.).

Instead of rhetoric Scaeva has tactics (230-246), treacherously deceiving a trusting Pompeian whom he then transfixes and boasting that if any Pompeian wants peace he must first lower his battle-standards in adoring submission to Caesar. Here too the poet elaborates four increasingly complex references to *virtus*. At first Scaeva's valour is the criminal *virtus* of killing a fellow citizen: *qui nesciret in armis/quam magnum virtus crimen civilibus esset* (148): but then it is renewed by the death of his Pompeian victim: *incaluit virtus* 240: he is reverenced as its embodiment, *vivam magnae speciem virtutis adorant* 254, but damned once more in the final *sententia* at 262 *infelix, quantum dominum virtute parasti.*

5. The Speeches Before and During Pharsalus

We began with Caesar addressing his men and urging them to the first acts of aggression. Let us end with his exhortation before Pharsalus and his actions during the battle. It cannot have been easy for Lucan to provide his Caesar with an *allocutio* that would outdo his previous words. But it may guide us through his speech – his longest in the whole poem – to relate it back to the speech at Ariminum. Here too Caesar begins with an ingratiating address, even more sonorous than before: *O domitor mundi, rerum fortuna mearum* (7.250). We might analyse the speech into eight sections. First then a guarantee of victory: "Fate is with us, and victory itself will prove that we had a more just cause in taking up arms" (Lucan himself declared at 1.126 that the gods preferred the victorious

cause). They may have attacked their country for him, but if they win the judgment of victory will exonerate them. In any case (and this is his second theme) they are fighting for themselves, not for him (263-265); he wants only a quiet retirement (could they have believed this?). This is as near as Caesar can come to the issue of *honestum*. Next he modulates to the question of ease and success. They will win without trouble, fighting only pampered Roman youths from the gymnasia and an assortment of eastern races (272-284). Fortune has blessed him, to be fighting with them at his side, his own known and trusted men (*meorum* [...] *manibus*); if they are the fierce fighting men he knows, they have already conquered. His apologies for holding back their passionate enthusiasm (*vos in tela furentes* 295) lead into the urgent declaration that this is the deciding moment (297-302). He is threatened with torture by a Sullan leader, but it is their fate that concerns him (307f.: we have returned to the theme of 263-265). Raising the tone to invoke the gods he now deals with the most difficult issue; attacking one's own fellow citizens (*quique suos cives, quod signa adversa tulerunt/non credit fecisse nefas* 314f.) and turns it by changing to consider the enemy not fighting but in flight. No man should attack an enemy from the rear; if he is in flight, he is a fellow citizen: *ne caedere quisquam/hostis terga velit. civis qui fugerit esto* (318f.). But while the battle continues they should not let piety deter them from killing kinsmen: and should they chance to violate no bond of kinship they should claim credit for the unknown's throat as if he committed a crime by being an enemy.[32] This is perhaps the trickiest sentence in his speech, but I believe it needs to be explained like Caesar's original reply to *Patria*: "The fault lies with the man who made me your enemy" (1.203). As an epilogue he urges them to assault the camp "from which the doomed enemy force has come."

When Lucan comes to describe the charge of armies, he makes it one-sided.

> civilia bella
> una acies patitur, gerit altera. frigidus inde
> stat gladius. calet omne nocens a Caesare ferrum.
> (7.501-503)

In action there is no doubt of right and wrong; Caesar and his men are the aggressors and Caesar is personified as *rabies populis stimulusque furorum*

32 I differ here from Duff's version of *tamquam scelus imputet hosti*, and from Dilke 1978 who suggests (citing Housman and Postgate): "if he wounds someone who is not a relative let him still claim credit (with me) for smiting this unknown enemy as if it were a crime."

(557) everywhere[33] urging each man on to violence, like Bellona and Mars himself (567-570). The nearest Lucan can approach single combat in this legionary context is in the two imagined vignettes with Brutus stalking Caesar unsuccessfully (586-596) because the tyrant must be reserved for death at the height of power, and Domitius dying heroically in battle (599-616).

Pompey's desperate flight from the battlefield interrupts the narrative and when Lucan returns to Caesar (728) it is in terms of his sated lust for bloodshed now granting life to the struggling soldiery (*agmina permisit vitae*). But in his imagined portrayal of Caesar giving the camp up to plunder, the poet goes beyond restraint, waxing indignant at the thought of common soldiers (*plebs*) occupying noble beds and the chambers of kings. It is this usurpation rather than the straight killing fields, which leads to his image of Caesar haunted and cursed by all the dead *omnes in Caesare manes* (776) incurring yet more guilt by his feasting and refusal to grant burial to the casualties.[34] There is a sense in which the victorious Caesar is now singled out and isolated from his own country like a polluted exile. His travels to Troy and Alexandria are like so many wanderings, and he will not speak to any Roman again in the poem as we have it. For company as he is at bay on Pharos, he has only the memory of Scaeva

> perpetuae meritum iam nomina famae
> ad Campos, Epidamne tuos, ubi solus apertis 545
> obsedit muris calcantem moenia Magnum.
> (10.544-46)

Was this to be Lucan's ending? I find it difficult to accept as any sort of closure, but for Caesar Pharsalus itself was closure, and (unless we allow for his rebuke to Ptolemy's *satelles*[35] and obituary of Pompey in 9.1064-1104) his rhetoric is silenced. Finally we should note that the Egyptian courtier accosts Caesar with virtually the same honorific as Laelius, but also as Caesar himself applied to the soldiery on the point of battle: *Terrarum domitor, Romanae maxime gentis* (9.1014) = *Romani maxime rector/nominis* (1.359-360) = *O domitor mundi, rerum fortuna mearum* (7.250). Now nations echo the mutual flattery of Caesar and the troops on whom he depended for glory and even survival.

33 On Caesar's ubiquity and omnipresence compare Florus 2.13.50 on the battle: *multus in eo proelio Caesar fuit, mediusque inter imperatorem et militem* [...] *voces quoque obequitantis acceptae, altera cruenta* [...] *"miles, faciem feri!" altera ad iactationem composita "parce civibus."*

34 See the forthcoming paper "Feasting after Pharsalus: reflections on Lucan's Caesar" by Christine Walde.

35 I am assuming this is Pothinus, whom Caesar subsequently had executed; Lucan does not name him.

Lucan 7: Speeches at War*

ALESSANDRO ROLIM DE MOURA

1. Introduction

The subject of innovation in the *Bellum Ciuile* has often been explored through the issue of the poem's supposed generic inadequacy. As is well known, already in antiquity Lucan raised a few eyebrows for writing a work which did not quite conform to the expectations of what an epic poem should be. This strangeness of Lucan's work was conceptualised in two ways: Lucan is not a poet either because he is too much of an orator, or because he writes history, not poetry.[1] The first of these problems, Lucan's rhetorical nature, springs from a number of features in his epic, amongst which I would like to focus on the outstanding role played by his long and elaborate speeches[2] and the emotional approach and constant interventions of his narrator, who indulges in invective and explicit political comments more frequently than his predecessors.[3]

My contribution deals with these two aspects of Lucan's rhetorical poetry from the point of view of dialogical relationships between different speeches and between the characters' speeches and the narrator's discourse. In doing this I want to highlight the agonistic elements of these

* The present text is a slightly modified version of a chapter in my D.Phil. thesis (Rolim de Moura 2008: 195-217). My research was funded by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, Ministry of Education, Brazil. Many thanks to my supervisor, Matthew Leigh, for his support and valuable advice, and to my examiners, Rhiannon Ash and William Fitzgerald, for helpful suggestions and criticism.

1 See Quint. *inst.* 10.1.90 and Serv. *Aen.* 1.382; cf. Petron. 118, Mart. 14.194, Lact. *inst.* 1.11.25, Isid. *orig.* 7.7, *Comment. Lucan. ad* 1.1, Arnulf of Orleans p. 4, 1-3 Marti, Narducci 1979: 31-3, Feeney 1991: 263-4 with n. 57, Quint 1993: 134, 386 n. 7. On Lucan and Quintilian, cf. also Ahl's paper in this volume.

2 On Lucan's speeches see Faust 1908, Morford 1967: 1-12, Tasler 1972, Schmitt 1995, and Helzle 1996: 83-143. On Caesar's speeches see also Fantham's paper in this volume.

3 For Lucan's narrator, see e.g. Seitz 1965, Marti 1975, Schlonski 1995, Effe 2004: 61-72.

relationships. Instead of analysing the speeches as isolated pieces of oratory, I will argue that it is possible to see them taking part in a debate and responding to one another, and therefore what matters is not only pathos, but also another kind of persuasion.[4]

In the case of certain forms of set speeches employed by Lucan, e.g. paired exhortation harangues before battle, the influence of historiography is evident. This will give us the opportunity to discuss some of the implications of the second generic unorthodoxy we have just referred to (Lucan as a historian). On the other hand, the narrator's voice, as we shall see, participates in the debate too, as several elements of his discourse can be understood as replies to the characters' words, just as some of the characters' statements can be thought of as rejoinders to the narrator-text.[5] We should observe in passing that an important rhetorical aspect of Lucan's narrator is his constant use of apostrophe.[6] Interpreting the narrator's relationship with the characters as one implying dialogue does justice to the apostrophe as a figure not to be dismissed as empty *cacoethes*; on the contrary, the procedure gains enormous significance in a narrative where the various *personae* seem to be so concerned with each other's words.

The study of some cases of responsion in the various discourses appearing in Lucan 7 will allow us to see the phenomena mentioned above in full display.

2. Speeches Before Battle in Lucan and the Historians

Book 7 of Lucan is the climax of the civil war. The reason for the heightened tension is the battle of Pharsalus, not only because of the display of military power implied by the deadly weapons and the movements of the huge armies (a power that, if it does not bring about a total massacre, surely suggests that a great destruction could be inflicted on the world if the warlords wanted to), but also because of the revealing speeches delivered in Thessaly. The different worldviews supported by these speeches

4 *Pace* Syndikus 1958: 37, Tasler 1972: 12-13, and Anziger 2007: 154.

5 On elements of dialogue between the Lucanian narrator and the characters, cf. Ahl 1976: 176 n. 46, Hutchinson 1993: 315 n. 46, Schlonski 1995: 163, Fantham 1999: 112 n. 14. I tend to interpret linguistic echoes between different speeches in Lucan as marks of dialogue; Berti 2000: 84 *ad* 39, following Ollfors 1967, sees such repetitions as mechanical recombinations of words, "un fenomeno attiguo a quello della formularità". Ollfors' failure to differentiate between deliberate and unintentional repetitions in the *Bellum Ciuile* is criticised by Bramble 1968: 180; cf. Schönberger 1961. For a more nuanced treatment of repetition in Latin poetry, see Wills 1996.

6 See D'Alessandro Behr 2005 and esp. 2007 plus bibliography on apostrophe cited there.

are at serious risk, for the context is going to test their persuasive power in a direct relationship with action. The performative strength of words is here more evident than ever, and instead of the supposed vacuity of declamations, we have discourses on the success or failure on which many things depend: the morale of the troops and its consequences for the result of the battle are just the most obvious among them.[7]

We have to be aware that speeches before battle are a *topos* of historiography, and in this genre we will find many examples of paired orations (either hortatory or belonging to another genre) which constitute a set of models for the paired exhortations of Caesar and Pompey in Lucan. One of the most conspicuous preserved instances of the structure drawn up by Lucan is Livy 21.40-44, where the historian, as Walsh notes, "deliberately introduces a balance of topics between the two speeches, almost as if Hannibal had been present at Scipio's speech and were answering it",[8] a phenomenon we will see repeated in the *Bellum Ciuile* in book 7. As anyone familiar with this tradition will be able to perceive, Lucan's hortatory harangues clearly present many *topoi* of the genre.[9] This should make us cautious when identifying traces of dialogue between Caesar's and Pompey's addresses, as they may partly be the result of both being constructed in accordance with the same generic rules. Of course, this is in itself already a form of dialogue. But the manifold responsion that links these speeches has also the effect of showing Pompey and Caesar interacting with each other through a common process of reacting to a repertoire of politically significant ideas, which are themselves highly dialogised and, so to say, in conflict. Quite in line with this thought, one can say that the similarities between Lucan's version of the speeches before Pharsalus and

7 On the importance of the exhortation speech in military affairs, see Onasander *Strategicus* 1.13-16. It was naturally the habitual practice of actual generals to deliver such speeches: see Caes. *civ.* 3.90.1: *exercitum cum militari more ad pugnam cohortaretur* (ed. Klotz). On the forms they may have taken, see Hansen 1993 and 1998.

8 Walsh 1973: 198. See Polybius' version of the speeches before the fight near the Ticinus at 3.62-64. Another important example is Livy 30.30.3-30.31.9, with Hannibal and Scipio's speeches before Zama. Thucydides was probably the inventor of the technique of composing paired *cohortationes* answering one another, e.g. 2.87 and 89 (see Albertus 1908: 7, 25, 28-9, 38-40, Goebel 1981: 82 n. 11; the influence of this procedure found in historiography on Lucan has been recently pointed out again by Pitcher 2008: 245). The bibliography on the use of speeches by ancient historians is immense. See e.g. Catin 1944: 167-73, de Romilly 1956: 180-239, Lang 1984, Hornblower 1987: 56, 59, Laird 1999: 121-52, Pelling 2002, Marincola 2007.

9 This can be easily verified by analysing Lucan's examples in the light of the data assembled by Albertus 1908 and Highet 1972: 82-9. Goebel 1981 carries out just this kind of analysis.

the account of them in sources such as Appian and Caesar point not only to the fact that the poet and the prose writers are reworking the same literary tradition, but probably also to Lucan's drawing on what was actually said by the generals on that decisive day. To demonstrate simultaneously these two points is the main intention of my providing some parallels between Lucan and the historians. Our poet places his speeches in a highly artful and engaged framework, the tendentiousness of which can be justly termed ideological. Not that the historians are not also representatives of an ideological approach, but Lucan's engagement is much more emotional, and the political position he reveals, coloured with the most bitter irony and indignation, is, with regard to this episode, arguably unique. More than this, Lucan's poetry is capable of bringing out these political problems in a dialogical structure that involves the narrator as well, as he, perhaps more than ever, attempts to respond to the characters' speeches and acts, and thus literally takes part in the battle. In what follows I intend to study some relevant military orations in Lucan alongside their connections with other speeches, giving special emphasis, of course, to speeches within the poem, but also acknowledging Lucan's debt to other authors, in the historical tradition or elsewhere.

3. *Addidit inualidae robur facundia causae*

When the morning of Pharsalus comes, the first sound to be heard is the muttering of Pompey's army. The soldiers' opinions are first conveyed through a passage in indirect speech at 7.45-57, to which is appended an apostrophe to the gods where the narrator envisages himself as one of the warriors (58-61); then these opinions are given another form and channelled through Cicero's speech (68-85),[10] as is made explicit in 62-65: *cunctorum uoces Romani maximus auctor/Tullius eloquii* |...|*/pertulit.*[11] Let us read Cicero's *suasoria* in full:

> 'hoc pro tot meritis solum te, Magne, precatur
> uti se Fortuna uelis, proceresque tuorum
> castrorum regesque tui cum supplice mundo
> adfusi uinci socerum patiare rogamus.

10 It is a known fact that Cicero was not present at Pharsalus, but had stayed behind in a camp near Dyrrhachium. See *Liv. perioch.* 111: *Cicero in castris remansit, uir nihil minus quam ad bella natus* (ed. Rossbach), *Comment. Lucan. ad* 7.62, Cic. *fam.* 9.18.2, *div.* 68-69, Plut. *Cat. Mi.* 55, *Cic.* 39.1. Note Caesar's account of Pompey's council of war at *civ.* 3.86-87, where he identifies an excess of confidence in his adversaries.

11 Lucan is always quoted in accordance with Housman's edition.

umani generis tam longo tempore bellum
Caesar erit? merito Pompeium uincere lente
gentibus indignum est a transcurrente subactis.
quo tibi feruor abit aut quo fiducia fati?
de superis, ingrate, times causamque senatus
credere dis dubitas? ipsae tua signa reuellent
prosilientque acies: pudeat uicisse coactum.
si duce te iusso, si nobis bella geruntur,
sit iuris, quocumque uelint, concurrere campo.
quid mundi gladios a sanguine Caesaris arces?
uibrant tela manus, uix signa morantia quisquam
expectat: propera, ne te tua classica linquant.
scire senatus auet, miles te, Magne, sequatur
an comes.'

The political ability of the orator appears in his perfect understanding of the crowd's anxieties. To each one of the groups composing Magnus' multi-ethnic army he gives an individual place in his short oration. Touching upon the issues of Pompey's fears and slowness (see esp. *Pompeium uincere lente* 73, and *de superis* |...| *times* 76), Cicero reinforces the *segnis pauidusque uocatur* of line 52, while *nimium patiens soceri Pompeius* (53) is picked up by *uinci socerum patiare rogamus* (71). The point of view of the foreign auxiliaries, particularly annoyed by the fact that the war keeps them far from their home countries (56f.), is included through Cicero's references to the *gentes* conquered by Magnus (75) and the *reges* under his authority (70), as well as through the insistence on the worldwide character of the army (e.g. *mundi gladios* 81). In the indirect speech no allusion to the senate is made, but Cicero is keen to observe that the *patres* are anxious too.[12] The comment of the narrator at 67, *addidit inualidae robur facundia causae*, brings out a traditional view of oratory as a mendacious art (see Arist. *Rh.* 1402a18-28 and Cic. *de orat.* 2.30), and thus indicates, to some extent, Lucan's awareness of rhetorical theory.

It is surely important to observe the contradiction between, on one side, the account of Livy, claiming that Cicero was not made for war (*Liv. perioch.* 111), complemented by the orator's own version, in *fam.* 7.3.2 (to the effect that he not only tried to convince Pompey to postpone the battle, but, before this, also tried to predispose him to an armistice), and, on the other side, the account of Lucan, in which Cicero asks for the start of hostilities. Lucan could not be unaware of Cicero's absence (or his abandoning the war after Pharsalia). The decision to depict the politician (famous for his *cedant arma togae*) on the battlefield, and uttering such a bellicose speech, must have its motivation. The narrator himself

12 For the ambiguous position of the senate in this scene, see Leigh 1997: 146f.

acknowledges the so-to-say 'pacific' nature of Cicero at 63f., when he says that under the government of law and civil jurisdiction Catilina feared the 'pacific axes' (*pacificas* |...| *securis* 64) of consular authority.[13] To point to the violence implied in the political use of words and the danger of political life is probably one of the intentions of this contradiction.

Pompey's answer comes full of distress and sad resignation. He admits he is being forced to fight, but not to his shame. He believes he could achieve victory with no bloodshed, yet, if this is true, it is not clear why he lacks authority to impose such a decision on the troops.[14] Actually,

13 See Dilke 1960 *ad loc.* The paradox of using war to re-establish peace is patent, esp. in Cicero's speech at 72f.: *humani generis tam longo tempore bellum/Caesar erit?* This is also a translation of the crowd's ultimate aim: to finish the war, something which is made clear in the indirect speech section when it is said that Pompey "dreaded peace" (55) due to his desire to remain in command of his huge world army forever. Note the reminiscence of Cato's words in 2.320-322, esp. *totius sibi ius promittere mundi* at 321. Also Appian *B.C.* 2.67.278 refers to the accusation that Pompey prolonged the war because of φιλαρχία: ἵν' ἀνδρῶν ὁμοτίμων τοσῶνδε ἄρχοι, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε αὐτὸν βασιλέα τὲ βασιλέων καὶ Ἀγαμέμνονα καλούντων (ed. Mendelssohn and Viereck). The identification of Magnus with Agamemnon also implicitly underpins Appian's tragedy-like statement that during the whole war Pompey was misled by a god (θεοῦ βλάπτοντος). For ancient and modern bibliography on this likening of Pompey to the Greek character see Berno 2004: 79-84, esp. 82 n. 20 (where she mentions another personage Pompey was compared to in ancient times: Alexander the Great; see e.g. Plut. *Pomp.* 46.1). Photius records Ptolemaeus Chennos' account of Magnus' perception of this comparison with Agamemnon, showing him as an admirer of the Greek hero (Ptol. Chenn. *ap.* Phot. *Bibl.* 190.151a16-18: ὁ Μάγνος οὐδ' εἰς πόλεμον προίοι, πρὶν ἂν τὸ λ Ἰλιάδος ἀναγνώσειε, ζηλωτὴς ὢν Ἀγαμέμνονος – ed. Henry). Berno 2004: 82 n. 18 shows that Pompey self-consciously encouraged the comparison by offering the games put on in 55 BCE to inaugurate his theatre (and the temple of *Venus Victrix*; see Cic. *fam.* 7.1), where Spurius Maecius staged the plays *Clytaemestra* (a tragedy by Accius) and *Equus Troianus* (either by Livius Andronicus or by Naevius). Cicero (*fam.* 7.1.2) says the productions assembled an extremely rich apparatus of visual effects (hundreds of mules, thousands of bowls, display of various infantry and cavalry equipments in some battle scenes). This quite unhappy piece of propaganda was meant to turn against its author.

14 Appian's account at *B.C.* 2.66.275 has some data relevant to our case: [Pompey] ἐπικίνδυνον μὲν ἡγεῖτο γεγυμνασμένοις καὶ ἀπογινώσκουσιν αὐτῶν ἀνδράσι καὶ τύχῃ Καίσαρος λαμπρᾷ περὶ τῶν ὅλων συνενεχθῆναι δι' ἑνὸς ἔργου, δυνατώτερον δὲ καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον ἐκτρῦσαι ταῖς ἀπορίαις αὐτοὺς οὔτε γῆς εὐπόρου κρατοῦντας οὔτε θαλάσσῃ χρωμένους οὔτε ναῦς ἐς φυγὴν ταχεῖαν ἔχοντας. Magnus appears here as well willing to protract the war, and his motives were not implausible. Both Appian and Lucan say Pompey hoped to win by slowly debilitating the enemy. Lucan 7.98f. has him say that the Caesareans are short of supplies (as Appian does at *B.C.* 2.67.277). However, the notion that it is a great peril to risk everything in a combat against men who have been driven to despair could be more effectively used in an exhortation to patience (in Lucan Pompey hints

he reveals a wish to die similar to that expressed by Cato in book 2: the difference is that here his death would not mean the end of the war, or the army's salvation, as in a *deuotio*,[15] but only a convenient suicide destined to terminate a life that is turning into a burden. Pompey is tired. He maybe would prefer to leave all these decisions to the others, and his speech contains many attempts to pass off responsibility, not only stressing the role of fate in the direction of the events, but also putting himself in an inferior position in relation to his men and allies: *si placet hoc* |...| *cunctis, si milite Magno,/non duce tempus eget, nil ultra fata morabor* – "if it is that what everybody wants, if the hour requires Magnus as a soldier, not as a leader, I will not delay the destinies any longer"(87f.), where he clearly reshapes Cicero's words,[16] or *res mihi Romanas dederas, Fortuna, regendas:/accipe maiores et caeco in Marte tuere* – "Fortune, you gave me the Roman republic to rule: receive it back greater and protect it during blind war"(110f.). The intention of reversing some of the arguments presented by Cicero through the reworking of verbal material is apparent enough, but in his depressing reply Pompey is using the powerful help of another distinguished rhetorician: the narrator, in whose previous interventions the general could find abundant suggestions, as if in a *diuisio* or *sermo* set out by a teacher of oratory. The most evident of these would hardly pass unnoticed even by the sleepiest of Lucan's readers: *quis furor, o caeci, scelerum?* (7.95, echoing 1.8). The overall sense is the omnipresent identification of civil war with crime newly brought again to the surface by the most recent of the narrator's apostrophes (see 7.58f., *hoc placet, o superi, cum uobis uertere cuncta/propositum, nostris erroribus addere crimen?*), in which his closeness to the characters is conspicuously marked

---

at the idea in 7.99-101). The other potentates on campaign on Pompey's side, nevertheless, prevail on their leader, and the fight must be launched. Note the expression *bella trahi* in Lucan's presentation of the protests of Magnus' troops at 7.57, and Caesar's remark at 7.296f.: *ueniam date bella trahenti:/spe trepido.* This is a play on a situation which is typical of Livy: a general unwillingly precipitates a battle under the pressure of his impatient subordinates, who complain that the war is being dragged out. See e.g. Livy 7.12.10-7.14.5, and Leigh 1997: 115-18. An allegation of protracting the war is put to political use also in Sall. *Iug.* 64.5: *ab imperatore consulto* [sc. *bella*] *trahi, quod homo inanis et regiae superbiae imperio nimis gauderet* (ed. Reynolds).

15 For a discussion of different forms of *deuotio*, the Decian examples, and the controversy over their historicity, see Oakley 1998 ad Livy 8.8.19-11.1, with bibliography at p. 486.

16 So Sklenář 2003: 112. Note the same idea in Appian's version of Pompey's *paraceleusis* at *B.C.* 2.72.299-300 (an incredibly unfortunate discursive manoeuvre), and Caesar's answer at 2.74.307: οὐδὲ στρατηγοῦντα ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ στρατηγούμενον. For the inconvenience of Magnus' attitude in this kind of speech, see Caes. *civ.* 3.92.4-5.

(notice also line 60: *cladibus inruimus nocituraque poscimus arma*). But another aspect of this dialogue between Pompey and the narrator appears in the latter's comments on the general's speech:

> |...] sic fatur et arma
> permittit populis frenosque furentibus ira
> laxat et ut uictus uiolento nauita Coro
> dat regimen uentis ignauumque arte relicta
> puppis onus trahitur. |...] (7.123-127)

The expression *ignauum onus*, although possibly referring to *puppis* in the simile, can easily be felt to apply to *nauita*,[17] and consequently to Pompey, which is by no means a compliment.[18]

4. "They did not have anything different to say on either side..." True?

Particularly revealing for the generals' exhortations before battle is Dio Cassius 41.57, where the pair of orations is presented in indirect speech and accompanied by Dio's acid observations:[19]

> τοῖς στρατιώταις πολλὰ μὲν παραπλήσια δ' οὖν ἀλλήλοις παρῆνεσαν, εἰπόντες πάνυ' ὅσα ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ πρός τε τὸ αὐτίκα τοῦ κινδύνου καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἔπειτα πρέπει λέγεσθαι. ἔκ τε γὰρ τῆς αὐτῆς πολιτείας ὁρμώμενοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν λόγους ποιούμενοι, καὶ ἀλλήλους τε τυράννους καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐλευθερωτὰς αὐτῶν ὀνομάζοντες, οὐδέν σφισι διάφορον εἰπεῖν ἔσχον, ἀλλ' ὅτι τοῖς μὲν ἀποθανεῖν, τοῖς δὲ σωθῆναι, καὶ τοῖς μὲν αἰχμαλώτοις, τοῖς δὲ ἐν δεσπότου μοίρᾳ πάντα τε ἔχειν ἢ πάντων στερηθῆναι, καὶ παθεῖν ἢ ποιῆσαι δεινότατα, ὑπάρξει. τοιαύτας οὖν δή τινας παραινέσεις τοῖς πολίταις ποιησάμενοι, καὶ προσέτι καὶ τὰ τῶν ὑπηκόων τῶν τε συμμάχων πρός τε τὰς ἐλπίδας τῶν κρεισσόνων καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φόβους τῶν χειρόνων προαγαγόντες, συνέβαλον ἀλλήλοις τοὺς ὁμοφύλους, τοὺς συσκήνους, τοὺς συσσίτους, τοὺς ὁμοσπόνδους.

17 So *Supp. Adn. ad* 7.127.

18 See Lewis & Short 880 s.v. *ignauus*. Cf. *Comment. Lucan. ad* 7.127, *Adn. ad* loc., Housman *ad* 7.125, Bourgery and Ponchont p. 48 n. 1, Dilke 1960 *ad* 125-7, Gagliardi 1975 *ad* 127.

19 For another historical account of Caesar and Pompey's *Redepaar* before Pharsalus, see App. *B.C.* 2.72-74. Caesar's *Bellum Ciuile* has a more complicated structure, with the speeches of Magnus and Labienus at the council of war (3.86f.), both of which have an exhortative character, setting out the counterpart for Caesar's two parainetic interventions (3.85.4 and 3.90) and one short exhortation delivered by Crastinus (3.91.2-3). For an analysis of the Lucanian version of the exhortation speeches and their insertion in the scene's structure, see Lebek 1976: 227-238.

καὶ τί ἄν τις τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὀδύραιτο, ὁπότε καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐκεῖνοι πάντα τε ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις ὄντες, καὶ προσέτι πολλῶν μὲν λόγων ἀπορρήτων, πολλῶν δὲ καὶ ἔργων ὁμοίων κεκοινωνηκότες, κῆδός τέ ποτε συναψάμενοι καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ παιδίον, ὁ μὲν ὡς πατήρ, ὁ δὲ ὡς πάππος, ἀγαπήσαντες, ὅμως ἐμάχοντο; ὅσα γὰρ ἡ φύσις τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν μίξασα συνέδησε, τοσαῦτα τῇ ἀπλήστῳ τῆς δυναστείας ἐπιθυμίᾳ διέλυον καὶ διέσπων καὶ διερρήγνυσαν. καὶ δι' ἐκείνους καὶ ἡ Ῥώμη περί τε ἑαυτῇ καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἅμα κινδυνεύειν ἠναγκάζετο, ὥστε καὶ νικήσασα ἡττηθῆναι.

This passage[20] is relevant in many ways. First of all, it is a condensed manual for military *paraceleuseis*,[21] which arranges the basic topoi while slightly sneering at the banality of such occasions. Additionally, it provides a sociological explanation, so to speak, for the similarities between the speeches, which in his malevolent account are reduced to absolute identity. In Dio's analysis (for a better understanding it is advisable to read also 41.56) of the political and ideological context in which the battle took place, perhaps heavily dependent on Livy's lost version, one can see the importance of the crime against kinship implied in civil war. Anyway, however important Livy may have been, the poet probably used other authors' accounts for many details here, although his arrangement and overall effect are rather original.

Caesar begins his speech in Lucan (7.250-329) appealing to his soldiers' pride, and at the same time marking a very clear political view: *domitor mundi* (250)[22] in apposition to *miles* (251), assumes an immediate imperial allure in its evocation of *dominus* (a word which is used contemptuously by the narrator in many passages, e.g. 5.386 and 6.262, by other anti-monarchical voices in the poem, as Figulus at 1.670,[23] and, as one

20 Ed. Dindorf.

21 Cf. Aeneas Tacticus 38.5; Onasander *Strategicus* 13.3 (where it is said that many such discourses are not persuasive, since they may be felt as having been artificially prepared for the occasion) and 14.3-4; Veg. *mil.* 3.9.11-3 and 3.12.3-3.12.4.

22 Cf., in the same speech, *spem mundi petitis* (270). See also the answer of Pompey at 352-3, an attempt to contradict Caesar's boastful pretensions of world conquest. At App. *B.C.* 2.72.301 Pompey uses the *honestum* argument while opposing his defence of liberty, country, and laws to a pirate-like attempt at seizing tyrannical power. On the whole, this speech by Caesar develops some themes already present in his previous interventions in the poem. Some similarities in the wording are worth noticing: for instance, 7.259-260 with 1.260 plus 1.226. I am indebted to Radicke 2004: 397 n. 77 for this parallel, but I think we should add 1.227 to the above-mentioned passages, and see its strong connection with 7.263 as well.

23 For Figulus' political convictions see Wuilleumier and Le Bonniec 1962 *ad* 639-672 and Leigh 1997: 26 n. 32. See also Lucan 3.152, another occurrence of *dominus* in a republican discourse, this time Cotta's.

would expect, also by Pompey in his equivalent Pharsalian harangue, at 7.373). In addition, the equation between *rerum fortuna mearum* (7.250) and *miles* puts in extraordinarily concise form the militarisation of Roman destiny, while the monarchical bias is suggested also by the first person possessive pronoun restricting *res* (which, in a so markedly political speech, could easily recall 'state'). Another bold assumption of the aims of Caesar's party appears at line 253: *in manibus uestris, quantus sit Caesar, habetis*. It is an explicit disclosure of the cult of personality which is so important to the *principatus*.[24] Caesar's insistence on the idea that his power is the expression of his army's competence reinforces the affective links between the commander and the troops, and later on, at 264-269, these links are manipulated by Caesar in terms of his ability to put on a political theatre: he portrays himself as the representative of the army's desire to rule. As the performer of the throng's projections, he can assume the appearance of a modest citizen (267: *modicum conponere ciuem*), he can be anything they want (268: *nihil esse recuso*).[25] To Radicke, the speech presents Caesar in two ways: falsely appearing as republican (at 264-9; in the spirit of Crastinus' words at Caes. *civ.* 3.91.2: *et ille* [sc. *Caesar*] *suam dignitatem et nos nostram libertatem recuperabimus*) and unmasking himself at times (as in 295-300).[26] To counterbalance all this we are presented with the different objectives put forward by Magnus and also with his idea of leaving power: 354-356 suggests the aim of having Pompey as a leader is merely to win this war. Given this claim and what is said in the previous lines, the promised horizon is the return to republican normality. Still we know that this is probably not true.[27]

The most significant occurrence of the word *dominus* in the narrator's discourse, though, at least as regards the dialogue it fosters with the opening of Caesar's climactic speech, is that coming in a famous lament where the poet clearly betrays his wish to fight. I am talking of 7.645f.: *post proelia natis/si dominum, Fortuna, dabas, et bella dedisses*, where the recurrence of Fortuna strengthens the connection.[28] The temporal marker

24 Cf. 7.299-300 and Gagliardi 1975 *ad loc.*

25 On the relationship between armies and generals in Lucan, see Gall 2005.

26 Radicke 2004: 399-400.

27 Consider, for instance, how the idea that the 'size' of Caesar (*quantus* 253) is in the soldiers' hands corresponds to Pompey's reference to himself as 'the Great', when in a similar move he talks about his dependance on the soldiers, at 7.379: *Magnus, nisi uincitis, exul*.

28 Working for the same effect is the position of *Fortuna* and *dominus* at the close of the narrator's intervention, responding to another position of emphasis (the opening) in Caesar's discourse. Something similar is obtained by the words *seruire senex*, closing Pompey's address to the soldiers at 382, in strong contrast with Caesar's *domitor* [...]/*miles*, and by the end of another, more

post proelia locates the focus of this utterance in the aftermath of the battle, the consequence of which is the 'master' given by Fortune to the ones who were born from that time onward: the war is decided, yet the narrator is willing to struggle. As if following the poet's remarks about the outcome of the fighting at Pharsalus, Pompey feels that his fortune is doomed. His focalisation is presented immediately after *bella dedisses* ("you should have given wars [for us to fight]"), and the decision to retreat rounds out the letdown already present in the narrator's vain prayer. Particularly remarkable are lines 647-649, because of the verbal links with the previous speeches (both by Caesar, esp. 7.250, 297-298, 307, and by the narrator, esp. 7.85f., 244):

> iam Magnus transisse deos Romanaque fata
> senserat infelix, tota uix clade coactus
> fortunam damnare suam.

The presence of *post proelia natis*, although it transports us to the narrator's time, does not have to make us forget that, in terms of the narrative's material structure, this significant bravado of the poetic voice comes just before the scene where Magnus acknowledges his defeat and prepares his withdrawal, and immediately after Domitius' death, that is, still in the middle of the carnage. This is worth noticing because it shows the narrator's sensibility and urge to react while being teased by the contact with the factual and discursive matter he is conveying.[29]

---

reflexive, speech of Pompey (7.659-666), where *iam nihil est, Fortuna, meum* (666) is the melancholic counterpart to the enemy's *rerum fortuna mearum*. Looking back at Caesar's exhortation at 1.299-351, a striking parallel occurs in his last words (351): *detrahimus dominos urbi seruire paratae*. It is the first long speech by the triumvir, and the interesting feature about it is that it fails as an exhortation, according to the narrator because it recalled *pictas patriique penates* (353). This is nevertheless corrected by the immediate answer of Laelius (359-391), who eventually is successful in encouraging the troops. Caesar learns the lesson well, as he incorporates Laelius' impious and blood-thirsty suggestions into his decisive *parainesis* in book 7, but intelligently uses them in a lighter form and balanced with other elements, including some which were exaggerated in the first oration (as the emphasis on Pompey's connection with Sulla). He achieves thus the highest degree of persuasiveness. It is perhaps not a mere coincidence that the narrator, when describing at 1.386-391 the warm reception the soldiers give to Laelius' words, compares the army's shout to the roar caused by the Thracian North wind when it beats Mount Ossa and to the sound the bent forests on the Thessalian mountain send back to the sky. This is an overt indication that this dialogue in book 1 will bear some effect on the decisive battle on the Emathian fields.

29 For the merged temporalities in 7.630-646, at once conveying the immediacy of the battle of Pharsalus and pointing to the time of a Neronian poet and his future, see Leigh 1997: 77-80, where the linguistic devices producing this effect are clearly analysed.

In Caesar's harangue, lines 7.251f. (*adest totiens optatae copia pugnae. / nil opus est uotis, iam fatum accersite ferro*) give more strong verbal evidence that Lucan has structured the two generals' orations in neat opposition, so as to make their discursive differences as clear as possible.[30] As I have shown, the contrast between the speeches not only lays bare the differences in the characters' personalities and circumstances, putting side by side an impetuous and victorious man and a hesitating and weakened one, but works on a definite clash between an old republican ideology, faint-heartedly championed by Magnus, and a frank imperial view put forward by Caesar. Pompey's attempt at exhortation is comparatively short (7.342-382), and starts with the same idea of fulfilment of wishes and end of expectations that we find in his enemy's *exordium*: the *adest dies* topos is a shared feature in the two speeches (254, *haec est illa dies*, and Pompey's answer at 342-344, *'quem flagitat' inquit / 'uestra diem uirtus, finis ciuilibus armis, / quem quaesistis, adest* [...]').[31] Magnus echoes Caesar's words, e.g. *opus* and *ferrum* (his clause *extremum ferri superest opus*, at 345, recalling *nil opus est uotis, iam fatum accersite ferro*, at 252), but his points are built on more traditional values and seek to boost the troops' morale with an appeal to their loyalty to the laws (evoked at 351).

In fact, Pompey's discursive decrepitude and hypocrisy can be no match for Caesar's assertive eloquence, and it is no surprise that it is in the narrator that we find the most heroic warrior opposing the legions of the new regime. The unreality of Pompey's arguments (e.g. 358-360: "if destiny had brought back to us, to these times, the Curii, the Camilli, and the Decii who devoted their heads to death, they would stand on this side"; or the use of *credite*, "imagine", "pretend", at 369, 371, and 374), and his reliance on ancient symbols in a poem that shows they have lost their clear meaning and their old power, sound more like moribund nostalgic memories than an exhortation to fight. The last heroes cited, the Decii, with their ambiguous connotations of despair and suicide, are another bad rhetorical move, and the inanity of this suggestion of *deuotio* is later on denounced by Pompey's flight. This appeal to Roman legends can be compared to the sequence 369-76, which tries to strike the same sentiments with its visualisation of the senate,[32] the people of Rome, the matrons, and

30 Gagliardi 1975: 53 also notes this. Dilke 1960: 37 observes: "parts of Pompey's and Caesar's speeches seem to answer each other". Cf. Tasler 1972: 109-19.

31 Cf. Liv. 34.13.5. Note also App. *B.C.* 2.73.303, ἥδε δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα κρινεῖ πάντα· Caes. *civ.* 3.85.4.

32 The same senate evoked by Pompey in his exhortation (as well as in App. *B.C.* 2.72.301) is alluded to by Caesar in a much more effective ἐνάργεια at 292-4, where the senators are envisaged as a corpse stretched on the ground (note the narrator's appropriation of the image later on at 597-8). Compare Magnus'

Rome herself. The unconscious irony produced by Magnus lies in the fact that he separates these two Roman patriotic sketches by the insertion of an argument of a quite different nature: the superiority of his army, empowered by so many foreign auxiliary forces (360-8). He obviously hopes to inculcate confidence,[33] but how can one ignore that this is the ultimate demonstration that we are no longer fighting near the ramparts of our beloved sacred city, to defend our *penates*, as Pompey wants to depict, and that Rome is now an empire *extra muros*? On the other hand, this mass of foreign people is probably indifferent to who is going to be the Roman master, as Caesar puts it at 281-284, and cannot understand the ideals Magnus attempts to extol; if we concede that some of them would at least know Latin (*pace* Caesar's *mixtae dissona turbae/barbaries* at 272f.),[34] they can just feel humiliated by Pompey's arrogant *toto simul utimur orbe* (362): Caesar is surely right to observe that the barbarians "hate every Roman, and are more oppressed by the masters they know" (284-5).[35] The end of Pompey's harangue is, as it were, brandishing children,[36] and could move the jurors to acquit someone accused in the civil courts, but perhaps sounds embarrassing in the mouth of a politician whose ambitious vanity

---

credite with Caesar's *uideor* [...] *spectare*, and see Leigh 1997: 292, 296, 303-4. Caesar employs this figure again at 304-6, in a movement where he is speaking as a leader of the *populares*, and which culminates at 307: *cum duce Sullano gerimus ciuilia bella.*

33 Likewise, at App. *B.C.* 2.72.300 Pompey touches upon the numerical superiority of his troops, an argument which is certainly common in military *paraineseis*. Cf., for instance, Th. 6.68.2, where Nicias reminds the army of the alliance of several peoples on the Athenian side.

34 Cf. App. *B.C.* 2.75.314: πολύθρουν δὲ ἦν τὸ Πομπηίου συμμαχικὸν καὶ πολύγλωσσον. Observe how Livy 30.33.8-12 describes the situation in the Punic army before Zama; see esp. 30.33.11, *uaria adhortatio erat in exercitu inter tot homines quibus non lingua, non mos,* [...] *non causa militandi eadem esset* (ed. Conway and Johnson), and 30.33.12, where the use of interpreters is acknowledged. See also Liv. 28.12.2-5. Cf. Ash 1999: 67-70. Lucan's Caesar is in fact quoting from the narrator's description of Pompey's forces at 3.289f., *tam dissona uolgi/ora.*

35 Naturally Caesar turns the foreign origin of many Pompeian troops into a disadvantage also because of the supposed weakness and cowardice of the Greeks and other non-Roman peoples (270-274). According to Appian *B.C.* 2.74.308f., Caesar told his troops not even to pay attention to them during the fight. App. *B.C.* 2.75.314 actually says Pompey did not intend to make great use of the auxiliary forces: τὰ συμμαχικὰ δ' ἦγον ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ὡς ἐς ἐπίδειξιν. Note the dialogue between Lucan 7.273f. and 367f.

36 For the actual practice of brandishing children during speeches to make a moving appeal to the jury, see e.g. Cic. *de orat.* 1.227f., Ar. *V.* 560-575 and 975-978, Pl. *Ap.* 34b-35b, and Leigh 2004: 126 n. 30, 129 with n. 60. Cf. Quint. *inst.* 6.1.47.

and passivity had come to betray the ideals he was supposed to champion. At the same time, the increasingly personal tone assumed by the orator recalls the emphasis on the first person singular that is evident in another failed speech of Magnus, that of 2.529-595, again especially towards the end of the harangue (2.583-595), as if he were gradually losing control.[37]

The effect on the direct interlocutors emerges through the narrator's filter at 2.596-600 (esp. 598: *metum*), and is not unlike the reaction of the Roman part of the army at 7.382-384: *tam maesta locuti/uoce ducis flagrant animi, Romanaque uirtus/erigitur, placuitque mori, si uera timeret.* The sadness and fear is evident (cf. the words used to introduce the speech at 7.339-341: *.stat corde gelato/attonitus; tantoque duci sic arma timere/omen erat*), and as a natural response to this, the troops are more likely to expect an honourable death than a victory to save Rome. It is true that Magnus has not forgotten the troops' response to his speech at 2.529-595, and has noticed that the excessive preoccupation with his past conquests he showed on that occasion (2.555, *titulis* |...| *nostris*, and 568-84, esp. *meis* |...| *tropaeis*) must be replaced by attention to the soldiers' manliness (*uestra* |...| *uirtus* at 7.343).[38] Nevertheless, his *inuentio* and *dispositio* are surely not the best, and by the end of the speech he has already betrayed himself. Pompey's rhetorical effort maybe awakens the sense of moral superiority in some of the soldiers, but at the same time saps their will to conquer and lures them into the love of failure that stalks Cato's attitude and the very answer of Pompey to Cicero's *suasoria*.[39] One can hardly forget Pompey's fear when listening to the narrator's protests at 7.642-645:

> proxima quid suboles aut quid meruere nepotes
> in regnum nasci? pauide num gessimus arma
> teximus aut iugulos? alieni poena timoris
> in nostra ceruice sedet. |...| 645

Therefore, the poetic voice can only be viewed as 'Pompeian' as long as this means 'republican', for Pompey himself, however sympathetic as a contradictory individual, is presented as a political fiasco, entirely justifying the narrator's frustration. It is worth having a closer look at Pompey's words at 376-380:[40]

37 See Leigh 1997: 151-2 for this detail, and 110-57 for the generally ambivalent treatment of Pompey by Lucan. For different interpretations, see Bartsch 1997: esp. 73-100, and Marti 1945.

38 So Sklenář 2003: 109-15.

39 Cf. Johnson 1987: 42.

40 Note the verbal reminiscences of 4.338-341 (Afranius' supplication).

|...| siquis post pignora tanta
Pompeio locus est, cum prole et coniuge supplex,
imperii salua si maiestate liceret,
uoluerer ante pedes. Magnus, nisi uincitis, exul,
ludibrium soceri |...|. 380

At the end of his speech Pompey seems for a moment to contemplate the extent of his self-debasement, and reveals his worries about his *maiestas* (Duff: "I would grovel at your feet, if I could do it without sullying the dignity of my command"). The narrator will later pick on this sentiment in the ironical apostrophe addressed to Magnus on the occasion of his retreat (680-691):[41]

non gemitus, non fletus erat, saluaque uerendus 680
maiestate dolor, qualem te, Magne, decebat
Romanis praestare malis. non inpare uoltu
aspicis Emathiam: nec te uidere superbum
prospera bellorum nec fractum aduersa uidebunt;
quamque fuit laeto per tres infida triumphos 685
tam misero Fortuna minor. iam pondere fati
deposito securus abis; nunc tempora laeta
respexisse uacat, spes numquam inplenda recessit;
quid fueris nunc scire licet. fuge proelia dira
ac testare deos nullum, qui perstet in armis, 690
iam tibi, Magne, mori. |...|

Lines 683-684 contain one of those absurd remarks that reveal their irony by virtue of the incongruence between words and facts: "success in war never / saw you proud, adversity will never see you broken" (Braund). The other praises in the passage are no less embarrassingly contradicted by the subsequent action. Even the comment at 689 is studiously ambiguous: "Now it is possible to know what you were". Indeed *licet*. But *cui*? Surely Lucan means *tibi*? When the poet quotes *salua maiestate* (680f.) from the character's speech (378) he brings out Pompey's typical preoccupation with his public image, which had inconveniently emerged at the end of his harangue. *Maiestas* is obviously etymologically related to *magnus*, can be translated as "greatness, grandeur" and once more plays on the sarcastic connotations of Pompey's title.[42] In the act of abandoning his senatorial allies to die at Pharsalus, Pompey shows "no lamentation, nor tears – only a noble sorrow with no loss of dignity" (Duff), "a grief exactly fitting for

41 l. 682: praestare tuis G^1.

42 See Maltby 1991: 360 s.v. *maiestas*, OLD 1065 s.v. *maiestas* esp. 4, 5.a ("majesty of outward appearrence"), Lewis & Short 1101-2 s.v. *maiestas* (esp. I.2 ad finem, "as title of honor of the Roman emperors"), and Feeney 1986.

[him] / to show in Roman hardships" (Braund).[43] The poet singles out for criticism Pompey's concerns about appearances. No wonder the emphasis is put on outward expressions of grief: *gemitus, fletus* (both absent, as is becoming), *non inpare uoltu*. After these, 683-684 (*nec te uidere superbum / prospera bellorum nec fractum aduersa uidebunt*) fall like a bomb on any pretensions to seriousness one might try to read in the passage.

Lucan's criticism of Pompey points to the general's vain character and passivity. The latter aspect is in contradiction with Lucan's view of the civil war as a crime, so that even attacking the Caesareans would be criminal. That is why it is sometimes difficult to decide whether Lucan is praising Pompey for his pious lack of will to conquer or ironically hinting at his cowardice.[44] Narducci, when commenting on this contradiction, suggests that a possible solution for it would lie in endorsing the view that Caesar, having taken the initiative of the war, has excluded himself from the body of citizens, converting into an enemy of the state and thus justifying the use of violence against him in the public interest (as in Cic. *Phil.* 13.1).[45] So Pompey would be incapable of perceiving or responding to the full consequences of his own observation at 2.537-539:

> di melius, belli tulimus quod damna priores:
> coeperit inde nefas, iam iam me praeside Roma
> supplicium poenamque petat.

This irresoluteness in Pompey's attitude reappears in the poet's voice, and is never entirely solved there either. But it seems to me that what dominates in the narrator's approach, especially from book 7 onwards (but see 6.299-313), is the sense that Pompey should have acted more aggressively to defend the republic. A fairly consistent ironic approach to the character and a strong emphasis on his failures show that the poet has overcome his partial attachment to the general, and most of all wants to point to Pompey's shortcomings as a republican leader, both ideologically (as he too is a would-be tyrant) and otherwise (as his strategic, moral, and emotional limitations turn out to demonstrate).

Instead of putting too much trust in the a priori ideological righteousness of a cause, that would supposedly put the gods on the Pompeian side

43 Note the irony of *deceat*. See esp. OLD 490 s.v. *decet* 1.a, "to add grace to, adorn, become". I see no reason why this sense should be completely lost in the impersonal construction. See TLL V, 1, 131.42-6, 132.76-7 s.v. *decco* I, II, Tib. 3.8(= 4.2).7-9, Varro *rust.* 2.7.4.

44 This is one of the problems that made Masters 1992 speak of Lucan's 'fractured voice'.

45 Narducci 2002: 95-98.

(7.352-355),[46] Caesar knows the moral value of his party can be a historical construct based on a course of events which depend on his action. Lines 259-263 are crucial to this reasoning:

> haec, fato quae teste probet, quis iustius arma
> sumpserit; haec acies uictum factura nocentem est. 260
> si pro me patriam ferro flammisque petistis,
> nunc pugnate truces gladioque exsoluite culpam:
> nulla manus, belli mutato iudice, pura est.

First of all let us notice that this answers Pompey at 7.123 (*omne nefas uictoris erit*), and is in its turn picked up by the second speech of Magnus at 346-348 (*quisquis patriam carosque penates,/|...| quaerit,/ense petat*). But most interestingly these words of Caesar entertain a dialogue with the narrator, as they answer the poet's open question at 1.126f. (*quis iustius induit arma/scire nefas: magno se iudice quisque tuetur*), and explain merit as a consequence of deeds and as a matter of point of view. In this sense, the *sententia* of 7.263 is lapidary. Perhaps here we have a suggestion that Caesar is not only bound to win the war and thus turn the Stoic conception of destiny to his advantage, but is also going to publish a book of propaganda, by the persuasive qualities of which his judgement on the facts is going to prevail for ages. It appears that Caesar has improved on his first clear reply to *quis iustius induit arma*, i.e. *utendum est iudice bello* at 1.227, as now we can recognise there is room for an assessment of the conflict, beyond the *factum brutum* of military action. Conversely, the message coming from the narrator's persona is that someone took the

46 Note that while Pompey needs an intricate hypothesis to prove divine assistance to his cause, Caesar simply sees the gods helping him (297f.). At any rate, Caesar also tries to convince his troops that they stand for the better cause when he mentions the injustice of having been denied a triumph (256) and suggests the brutal nature of the Pompeian party (304-307, and 311-319, stressing Caesar's *clementia* with a hint at *pictas*). Appian's version at *B.C.* 2.73.305f. is keen to present *honestum* arguments in Caesar's harangue, specifying four of them: the triumph issue (with a patriotic twist: triumphs deserved by men who brought so many lands under Roman rule), Caesar's willingness to try an agreement (refused by the enemy; cf. Caes. *civ.* 3.90.1), his clemency, and his generosity. Appian also reproduces Caesar's order to spare the Roman fugitives (*B.C.* 2.74.309; cf. Lucan 7.318f.). The impious lines 320-325, however, seem to be an exclusively Lucanian touch (for the sense, see Postgate 1913 *ad loc.*). Impious indeed, but surely good in terms of military exhortation. For the effectiveness of a similar argument, see Cic. *Balb.* 51: *neque enim ille summus poeta noster Hannibalis illam magis cohortationem quam communem imperatoriam uoluit esse: 'hostem qui feriet †erit (inquit) mi† Carthaginiensis/quisquis erit. cuiatis siet'* (Enn. ann. 234-235 Skutsch = 276-277 Warmington; cf. the imitation of Silius 9.209-211). I quote Cicero's *Pro Balbo* from Peterson's edn., but print Ennius' passage as in Skutsch.

pains of being the other *iudex*, of writing an alternative version. That is explained in the beginning of the work (1.67f., *fert animus causas tantarum expromere rerum, /immensumque aperitur opus*) and in the always quoted passage (7.207-213) immediately before Caesar's address to his troops at Pharsalia, where the poet refers to his *magnus labor* and his *cura*, and says one of his aims is to move the readers to favour Pompey. Recalling 7.211 (*spesque metusque simul perituraque uota mouebunt*), I am tempted to ask if the wishes inspired by the poem were really bound to die and if the effect of reading the *Pharsalia* is only literary thrill. To Caesar, in any case, there are no *peritura uota*. He is confident in the concrete realisation of his triumphant destiny by the agency of violence; it is the opposing party that is *peritura*, as he states in the brilliant closure of his speech (329). Caesar is entirely convinced of the Ennian principle *fortibus est fortuna uiris data*;[47] to such a degree, that he bids his soldiers to destroy their rampart, the ditch and the camp as a whole (326-328). Having thus nowhere to hide in case of defeat, they are obliged to take over Pompey's camp by victory (as in App. *B.C.* 2.74.310). This fits in peculiarly well with Caesar's stance, since through the deliberate transformation of the circumstances the troops manage to impose on themselves a state of affairs that is usually beyond one's ability to choose, something appropriate to inspire another topos of military exhortations, namely 'victory or death'.[48] The way the narrator comments on the effects of Caesar's words (329-336) stresses the pragmatic force of the latter's policy: the soldiers are not assailed by fears, like the enemy; they simply start to obey Caesar's orders, to prepare their weapons and their meals.

5. Conclusion

We have seen that the presence of dialogical links between different voices in Lucan 7 is quite intense. Particularly notable is the fact that these links can be verified also between speeches delivered in different scenes, so that a speaker can respond to a speech that he actually has not heard, and that we find traces of dialogue even between voices that belong to different narratological planes, namely between the narrator, who is a function of the narrative, and the characters, who are situated in the story. I would like to postulate two explanations for these phenomena.

47 At *ann.* 233 Skutsch = 254 Warmington; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 10.284, Liv. 4.37.7, 5.19.8, and 8.29.5.

48 An almost identical situation, caused by fighting in the enemy's country, is found, with the accompanying parainetic topos, in Thucydides 3.85.3, 6.68.3-4, and Livy 21.43.3-5; cf. also Caes. *civ.* 3.87.5-7.

First of all, the dialogue typified by the responsion connecting Caesar's and Pompey's harangues before battle and, to some extent, also the dialogue between the characters and the narrator correspond to the dialogical angling of virtually any speech toward potential interlocutors within the same semiotic and ideological universe.[49] In that sense, Henderson's formulation for Lucan's poem, i.e. "The Word at War", is strikingly accurate.[50] It is in this connection that we should understand Vološinov's claim that the sign "becomes an arena of the class struggle".[51] In my view, however, Lucan expresses this conflict through relatively well characterised figures, each with his own ideological profile, not only through an abstract play of the signs. Actually, the way in which Lucan gives prominence to the circulation of ideas in the narrative and the re-elaboration of them by various voices is a witness to his complex understanding of the historical reality he sings of.

Secondly, the dialogue between the narrator and the characters can be explained as an instance of metalepsis, the violation of the threshold between narrative and story, by the workings of which the poet brings the heroes up to his level of consciousness.[52] Some degree of metalepsis is also present in the dialogical links between characters that do not physically hear each other's speeches, since in the Pharsalus episode we frequently have the impression that Caesar has had access to Pompey's harangue, and vice versa, as if they had been able to read the poem they inhabit as characters.[53]

Lucan was not the absolute inventor of the techniques discussed above,[54] but can be considered as a writer that employed them almost

49 A much-cited passage in Bakhtin's work provides good explanation for this: "On all its various routes toward the object, in all its directions, the word encounters an alien word and cannot help encountering it in a living, tension-filled interaction. Only the mythical Adam, who approached a virginal and as yet verbally unqualified world [...], could really have escaped [...] this dialogic interorientation with the alien word that occurs in the object" (Bakhtin 1981: 279).

50 Henderson 1987.

51 Vološinov 1973: 23.

52 For the concept of metalepsis, see Genette 1972: 135 n. 1, 243-5, 1983: 58-9, and particularly 2004.

53 See Sklenář 2003: 145.

54 Di Benedetto 1994 interprets some passages in the *Iliad* as suggesting a dialogue of sorts between the narrator and the characters (see esp. his p. 30). Certain verbal nexus between speeches delivered in different contexts by characters that are supposedly unaware of each other's words can also be interpreted as dialogical. Note what may be extrapolated from the use of βασιλεύτερος ("kingli-er") in *Il.* 9.160 and 392. Agamemnon employs this word to compare himself to Achilles in his reply to Nestor at 9.115-161. When Odysseus expounds to

obsessively, in particular when viewed against the background of his epic forerunners. This is one of the things that give him the status of an original writer who is at the same time historian, orator, and poet.

Achilles the reconciliation proposal, he repeats the list of gifts with little change in wording (9.264-299 transpose 122-157), but craftily omits the outrageous comparison. Achilles, nevertheless, is somehow conscious of it, and ironically pronounces βασιλεύτερος at 392 while refusing the presents (the word returns only once after this, at 10.239, again in Agamemnon's discourse). Of course, the theory of oral composition of the Homeric poems unavoidably makes one look at this in another light (for discussion, see Rolim de Moura 2008: 67-77). For dialogue between the narrator and the characters in Thucydides, see Rusten 1989 *ad* 2.41.1.

Bit by Bit Towards Death – Lucan's Scaeva and the Aesthetisization of Dying*

NICOLA HÖMKE

Iusque datum sceleri – Lucan starts the narrative in the proem of his epic, *Civil War*, *bella* [...] *plus quam civilia* (1.1), with this oxymoron. In a modified formulation, this thought also underlies the dark prophecy of the astrologer Nigidius Figulus: *scelerique nefando/nomen erit virtus* (1.668f.).

In 6.138-262 – and possibly holding the compositionally central position of the work[1] – Lucan again picks up his leitmotiv of the inversion of *ius* and *virtus* into *scelus* caused by the civil war and presents us with its incarnation: He introduces Cassius Scaeva, Caesar's distinguished centurion, who virtually single-handedly deflects the attempted break-out of the Pompeians during the siege of Dyrrachium – despite being severely injured – until Caesarian cohorts arrive to provide reinforcement.

Scaeva's characterization at 144-148 precisely matches that of the civil war in the proem. His recognition as a brave, highly distinguished soldier is juxtaposed with the accusation that he is *pronus ad omne nefas et qui nesciret, in armis/quam magnum virtus crimen civilibus esset* – "eager for every wrong, he did not know how great a crime is valour in a civil war"[2] (147f.). The replacement of the ethical parameters *ius* and *virtus* by *nefas* and *crimen* applies as much to Scaeva as to the *bella plus quam civilia*, and Scaeva consequently appears as the perfect embodiment of the civil war.

The narrator does much to emphasize the paradigmatic aspect of his Scaeva figure. Already during the description of the growing siege wall around Dyrrachium, he notes that the insanity of the civil war is now boiling at close quarters: *aestuat angusta rabies civilis harena* (6.63). When Pompey's troops are about to break through this fortification, he states

* Special thanks to Michael Osmann who translated this article, and to Janel B. Galvanek for her close reading and her valuable comments.

1 By favouring the idea that Lucan planned a twelve-book epic. For a discussion of this issue, see Ahl 1976: 306-326 and, more recent, Radicke 2004: 56-65.

2 English translation by S. H. Braund 1992.

that at this very moment world rule was within Pompey's grasp (*iam mundi iura patebant* 139). In this way, the struggle for the wall is stylized as the civil war *in nuce* and Scaeva as the Caesarian par excellence.

This episode has always received a great deal of attention in Lucan studies.[3]

This probably has something to do with the fact that Lucan handles the episode in a manner prototypical for his general working style – that is, prototypical for his approach to historiographical material, for his relation to the epic tradition in general and Virgil in particular, for the possible influence of stoic philosophy on his concept of the epic, but also for his confrontational approach to traditional moral and aesthetic values and his preference for themes of death, lurid effects and repulsive details.

In view of the conspicuous stylization and explicit ethical connotations of the Scaeva figure, the discussion[4] to date revolves in particular around the moral assessment of the Scaeva *aristeia* which the author intended and the particular understanding of *virtus* which underlies it. Ahl distinguishes, for example, between a practically-applied and a philosophically-loaded *virtus* concept: Scaeva demonstrates "military courage" but not "the more absolute virtus."[5]

Earlier, Rutz formulates it more pointedly when he notes that *virtus* is ab-solute [*sic*] in Lucan, detached from its ethical bonds and, therefore, becomes a possible component of evil.[6] The *virtus* problem is also closely linked to the question regarding to what extent it can be assumed that Lucan's concept of epic is determined by stoic views of history and stoic ethics.[7] Thus, Marti[8] emphasizes that Lucan presents two opposed *virtus* concepts, one imprinted by stoicism in the figure of Cato and the other paradoxically inverted in the figure of Scaeva. By contrast, D'Alessandro Behr[9] draws on the stoic *autarkeia* principle in order to attribute to Scaeva's actions a distinguishable *virtus* content.

---

3 For the last decades, see esp. the commentary on Lucan. 6.118-260 by Conte 1974 and the studies by Metger 1957: 165-177, Rutz 1960, Marti 1966, Johnson 1987, Schlonski 1995: 68-98 (chap. 4), Leigh 1997: 158-190 (chap. 5), Esposito 2001, Gorman 2001, Sklenář 2003, Reitz 2006, esp. 93-96, and D'Alessandro Behr 2007.

4 Leigh 1997: 159f. n. 1 provides a brief summary of the state of the discussion so far.

5 Ahl 1976: 120.

6 Rutz 1960: 474.

7 Most recently, Wiener 2006 and D'Alessandro Behr 2007, for example, argued for Lucan's concept of the epic being strongly influenced by stoicism. Cf. also Wiener's contribution in this volume.

8 Marti 1966: 254.

9 D'Alessandro Behr 2007: 45-53.

In the following, I would like to present a modified interpretation of the Scaeva episode and, for this purpose, will direct attention to its poetological and aesthetic implications. First, I will show how Scaeva – as the agent of a basic component, the epic *aristeia* – is first functionalized but then demolished. In my opinion, this sheds some light not only on Lucan's handling of the epic tradition, but also on his understanding of *virtus*. In a further step, I will demonstrate how Lucan shapes the Scaeva figure into a representative of the aesthetic concept presented in the *Bellum civile*, where the process of dying is advanced to the core of the epic statement as a problematized boundary crossing.

1. The Demolition of the Epic Hero

The Scaeva figure appears to be based on a historical event, as Marti[10] has demonstrated through an extensive search of the sources. Caesar reports in his *Bellum civile*[11] that after the battle at Dyrrachium, 120 arrow holes were found in the shield of his centurion Scaeva. Since the fortification was largely saved by his bravery, he was promoted and rewarded with 200,000 sesterces.

Various retellings of this event in exempla collections, such as that of Valerius Maximus[12] and in later civil war narratives such as those of Suetonius[13] and Appian[14], prove that Scaeva thereafter became ingrained into the Roman consciousness as the *exemplum virtutis et fortitudinis*. Therefore, from a historiographical perspective it appears obvious that Lucan should assign Scaeva a prominent position in his epic. But he does more than that: He elevates Scaeva from a historical, isolated case to the agent

10 Marti 1966: 239-243, thinks it possible that the foundation of the dramatization was already laid in the lost version by Livy.

11 Caes. *civ.* 3.53.3-5: *et cum laboris sui periculique testimonium adferre vellent, milia sagittarum circiter xxx in castellum coniecta Caesari renumeraverunt, scutoque ad eum relato Scaevae centurionis inventa sunt in eo foramina cxx. quem Caesar, ut erat de se meritus et de re publica, donatum milibus cc*** atque ab octavis ordinibus ad primum pilum se traducere pronuntiavit – eius enim ope castellum magna ex parte conservatum esse constabat* [...].

12 Val. Max. 3.2.23: [...] *cum pro castello enim, cui praepositus erat, dimicaret, Gnaeique Pompeii praefectus Iustulcius summo studio et magno militum numero ad id capiendum niteretur, omnes qui propius accesserant interemit, ac sine ullo regressu pedis pugnans super ingentem stragem, quam ipse fecerat, corruit. cuius capite umero femine saucio, oculo eruto, scutum centum et viginti ictibus perfossum apparuit.*

13 Suet. *Iul.* 68.

14 App. *B.C.* 2.60.

of an *aristeia*, an epic configuration of venerable tradition. Fantham[15] calls this passage "the only truly Homeric Aristeia of the whole epic." And indeed, the author reveals himself as being well acquainted with the epic tradition, e.g., by adopting the essential compositional scheme of an *aristeia*.[16] The aristeuon is briefly introduced (6.138-148) and then directs his *adhortatio* at his comrades (149-165). Their reaction follows (165-169). The battle starts with Scaeva's series of successes that are depicted as a virtual "potpourri of types of death" (169-188). The Pompeian counterattack follows (189-213) with an inserted short authorial reflection (196-201). The last phase of the aristeia is characterized by a single-combat scene. An anonymous archer severely wounds Scaeva and the hero appears exhausted (214-227), but he overcomes the critical situation and vanquishes the Pompeian Aulus using a ruse in another single battle (228-246). Only when reinforcements arrive does the hero collapse. He is then rescued by his comrades-in-arms and celebrated as a hero (247-257). The episode concludes with another authorial reflection (257-262). Furthermore, three epic comparisons to a leopard (180-183), a Libyan elephant (208-213) and a Pannonian bear (220-223) are incorporated into the individual combat phases.

Additional motival, linguistic and structural similarities to major epic *aristeiai* are unmistakable and have been analyzed in detail, for example, in relationship to the Turnus aristeia in Virg. *Aen.* 9, the Mecentius *aristeia* in *Aen.* 10[17] as well as the *aristeiai* of heroes in the *Iliad*.[18]

However, regarding the aristeuon, Lucan does not really comply with the epic tradition, but distances him from the heroes of the Virgilian or Homeric type by means of numerous disqualifying elements. Right from the introduction things take an unusual course: Scaeva is explicitly not *nobili genere* but rather originates from the common people. Likewise, his opponents are not named and remain anonymous. Aulus, the only exception, confirms the rule since his *praenomen* is emphatically an everyman's

15 Fantham 1995: [p. 1].

16 Cf. in this regard esp. Schlonski 1995: chap. 4.2.2-4.2.4.

17 Marti 1966, 247-250 especially points with respect to the epic comparisons and the *virtus* topic to the proximity of Turnus' battle with Pandarus (*Aen.* 9.722-761) and with Mnestheus (778-818), but also emphasizes that Lucan avoided further paralleling by using an emphatically independent vocabulary. Schlonski 1995: 81 and Fn. 51 sees the leap of the Trojan Helenor into the Latin troops (*Aen.* 9.551-555) and Turnus' saving leap into the river (*Aen.* 9.815f.) as compositional templates for Scaeva's leap from the wall into the enemy's army. The antithesis "One against all" is thus also found in the Turnus *aristeia* (*Aen.* 9.801) and the Mecentius *aristeia* (Aen. 10.691f.).

18 Sklenář 2003: 51-58 sees the episode in direct argument with Homeric heroes such as Diomedes.

name.[19] Scaeva's introductory *adhortatio* is marked as demagoguery by the author because Scaeva does not call his people to *virtus* and *pietas* but rather to *ira*, and he causes *furor* with his address (165). Combined with the preceding narrator's note that Scaeva does not know what a great crime *virtus* is in a civil war, any anticipation of a typical hero's *aristeia* with a moral model character is renounced in advance.

Although Lucan takes up the *aristeia* topos and implements it in a structurally recognizable form, it undergoes a fundamental reassessment regarding its moral implications relative to the known uses in Homer and Virgil.

But is this reassessment only related to the genealogical and moral insufficiency of Scaeva and to the inversion of the *virtus* concept? Or does the confrontation with the traditional epic hero's *aristeia* also take place on another level?

In 1997, Matthew Leigh convincingly laid out in his thoughtful book "Spectacle and Engagement"[20] that more is at stake than an intact *virtus* being employed in an unsuitable environment in the bellum civile. There, the innermost heart of *virtus* itself is corrupted by the civil war so that the exemplar character and absoluteness of *virtus* are subordinate to other intended effects. The didactic mission of *virtus*, which is teaching to emulate, is transformed into an appeal for impact, a concept of spectacle: *spectare* instead of *aemulari*, *mirari* instead of *imitari*. Leigh states: "The deformation of the traditional exemplary narrative makes it clear that Lucan's adventures in the grotesque actually serve subtler, more distancing and intellectualizing purposes than simple Steigerung des Pathos."[21]

I intend to take a step further along this path of interpretation and, for this purpose, direct one's view to the last battle scene. When Scaeva collapses "bearing in his breast a dense forest" (*densamque ferens in pectore silvam*, 205) and his enemies cheer, certain of victory, he resorts to a perfidious ruse. Apparently resigning (*virtute remota* 229), he appeals to his opposing fellow citizens to be carried into Pompey's camp to be allowed to die there (230-235). A Pompeian by the name of Aulus bends down to him and promptly pays for his credulity with his life as Scaeva thrusts a hidden sword into his body (236-239).

In my opinion, the most significant point is contained in the last sentence of Scaeva's deceptive words: "*sit Scaeva relicti/Caesaris exemplum potius quam mortis honestae*" (234f.) – "let Scaeva be a model of desertion

19 Therefore, the translation in Henderson 1988: 126, as "unlucky Joe" is particularly apt in my opinion. Sklenář 2003: 55 n. 68 correctly rejects the conjecture "Aunus" (v. 236) by Shackleton Bailey.

20 cf. esp. p. 171-184.

21 Leigh 1997: 184.

from Caesar rather than of honourable death!" Scaeva characterizes himself as an *exemplum* and lures his opponent with this self-estimation into his trap. The significance of this scene is that it goes beyond the internal fictional context onto the poetological level. The figure of Scaeva first explicitly insists on its particular literary tradition as the protagonist of an epic *aristeia*, only to soon break with it and reveal all as a treacherous and deceptive maneuver. The literary convention, according to which an *aristeia* is not only constitutive for the genre, but also predisposed with its positive morality, has been declared void.

Just as Scaeva lures his opponent into a trap within the fiction itself, Lucan does the same with readers who are familiar with epics. The reader must believe – because of both the *aristeia* frame as well as prior knowledge of the historical Scaeva's exemplar nature – that he is about to be presented with an *aristeia* that conforms to the genre. However, this expectation is increasingly placed into doubt by disqualifying elements and definitively carried *ad absurdum* in the Aulus scene.

It has often been argued that Lucan wanted to present an epic *aristeia* despite all this. In Barbara Feichtinger's explanation, for example, Lucan used epic structures because in the end he was not able to evade the heroizations inherent in the genre despite all efforts to the contrary. Thus, he fell prey to the fascination exerted by the epic tradition, exactly that which he had wished to rebel against.[22] Gorman, too, discusses Lucan's literary techniques from the premise that he only sought possibilities for forcing the epically 'undoable' situation of a civil war into an epic framework.[23] I am convinced, however, that Lucan was not thinking of such a rescue of the epic framework.[24] Rather, the entire Scaeva episode follows a well thought-out dramaturgy that derives its dynamics from the author's play upon the reader's expectations and results in a pointed rejection of the validity of an epic structure – and one that is morally loaded to boot.

The proposed interpretation of the Scaeva episode also touches upon the question mentioned above regarding the moral content of the *virtus*

22 Feichtinger 2007: 80.

23 Gorman 2001: 272.

24 Similar approaches can also be observed in the handling of other epic elements: In Book 5 Lucan transforms the traditional storm at sea from a trial of endurance of *virtus* and *constantia* into a manifestation of Caesar's *furor*. And in Book 6, immediately after the Scaeva episode, several epic elements are affected at once. Not only does Sextus Pompeius reject the religiously sanctioned questioning of the oracle as unreliable but favours black magic instead. Even the Thessalian witches, who then become the focus (and whose cosmic action conforms to the traditional representation of literary witches), are exposed to ridicule by the mouth of Erictho: She resorts instead to *novos ritus*. cf. Hömke 2006.

concept. As soon as the *aristeia* is unmasked as a deception to the reader, *virtus* loses its justification as an absolute and relative value. It is not enough that Lucan attempts here to represent Scaeva's actions as justified in a situationally restricted or shallow or philosophically abstract *virtus* concept. Rather, the result is that Lucan demonstrates to the reader the total failure and the invalidity of the *virtus* convention that has now been achieved, including its literary implementation as a hero's *aristeia*.

Furthermore, does Lucan at any time at all link Scaeva to the value *virtus*, which constitutes the *aristeia*? I would argue that Lucan cleverly deceives his readers by repeatedly using the term *virtus*, but not necessarily linking the term to Scaeva. This becomes clear when one reads the following passages:

1.) The first mention of *virtus* in association with Scaeva is made by the narrator in the general statement that *virtus* must be equated with *crimen* in the civil war (148f.).

2.) Scaeva himself never speaks of *virtus* in his *adhortatio*, but merely of *pietas* (155) or else of *ira* (155). However, the addressed soldiers feel inspired to death-defying *virtus* by him: *scituri iuvenes* |...| *an plus quam mortem virtus daret* (168f.), although the narrator here also sees *furor* raging (*movit tantum vox illa furorem* 165).

3.) In two passages the narrator describes Scaeva's actions as *virtus*, but the term is conspicuously linked to negative emotions. At 229 Scaeva suppresses *furor* and *virtus* as the commencement of his cunningly-feigned submission. The combination of the two terms suggests an outright equation, especially since at the beginning of his *adhortatio* the terms *pietas* and *ira* are coupled in a similar manner.[25] At 240 it is said of Scaeva that in view of the successful slaying of Aulus his *virtus* was again revived and drove him to a scornful diatribe. The unusual juncture *incaluit virtus* has already been noted[26] so that *virtus* here – a sort of play on words – is placed in lieu of the terms *furor* and *ira*, which are more fitting and expected.

4.) The honoring of the wounded Scaeva as *vivam magnae speciem virtutis* (254) is not described as an authorial estimation but rather merely from the perspective of the soldiers. Fantham already pointed to the potential devaluation of the *virtus* concept by adding the ambivalent *species*.[27]

5.) An ambiguity that can in this context only be understood ironically also characterizes the last mention of *virtus* when the narrator at the

25 cf. the relevant observation by Sklenář 2003: 54 regarding the assonance and metrically-identical position of *pietate remota* (155) and *virtute remota* (229).

26 Rutz 1960: 462f.

27 Fantham 1995: [p. 1].

end of the episode exclaims in his apostrophe directed at Scaeva: *Infelix, quanta dominum virtute parasti!* (262) The response to *quanta* could be: *virtus* was not involved, but merely *ira* and *furor*.

Thus, Lucan demolishes the topos of the epic *aristeia* in multiple fashions. It is not enough that the aristeuon violates various constituent characteristics of an epic *aristeia*, but with the *exemplum* trick Lucan deals the entire topos a poetological rejection. It is also not enough that Scaeva is only conceded a limited or depraved *virtus* when compared to other epic heroes: He literally appears separated from *virtus* in the conventional sense. The *virtus* concept is present throughout the entire episode, but is significantly not attributed to Scaeva himself but rather to the surrounding soldiers. Moreover, the narrator himself undermines the validity of the understanding of *virtus* with his assessments. It is as if Lucan wanted to demonstrate that in the face of civil war the people inside his epic (as well as those outside?) hold onto values that in fact no longer exist. Similarly, the reader familiar with the *aristeia* topos is repeatedly deceived. By contrast, Scaeva acts as if he would like to play with his own literary tradition and simultaneously demonstrate that *ira/furor* and *amor mortis* express his basic attitude better than the stereotype of an *exemplum virtutis* which has always been propagated in association with him.

2. Aesthetisization of Dying

The second part of my contribution looks at Scaeva as a model for Lucan's concept of aesthetisizing the horrific. Lucan's indulgence in horror and disgust, which is both linguistically and visually powerful, has always ignited heated discussions in scholarly literature. For a long time, one sought an explanation of his different design principles only in perhaps a tribute to the tastes of contemporary readers, or to his personal preferences or even to the events at Nero's court. Consequently, they were only to be understood as taken from the author's own experiences. Fortunately, these types of explanations no longer satisfy modern scholarship.[28] If one analyzes[29] the quantity, quality, distribution and mutual intermeshing of such scenes dominated by repulsive details over the entire epic, it becomes clear that Lucan directs the focus on two motifs and conceptualizes them as the central aspects of his epic's overall statement: The destruction of the physical integrity (through a step-by-step and detailed deterioration)

28 Representative of earlier research is, e.g., Bourgéry 1928: 301 ("L'amour du mystère et le gout du supernaturel").

29 This essay forms part of a larger study in which I am analyzing the narrative patterns of the gruesome and horrific in Lucan's epic.

and dying as a process with an independent quality and dynamic – be it short or tormented; leading to death or thwarted in favor of further transitory life; 'simply' or 'doubly' motivated; described in realistic or grossly-exaggerated terms; or arranged for an individual, an interacting group or an anonymous mass.

Again, Lucan's Scaeva figure plays a key role in the process because it unites both aspects in extenso in itself. Already in his *adhortatio* Scaeva leaves no doubt as to the objective of the combat: *Terga datis morti?* (153) he asks his soldiers outraged. What first looks like a single metonymic escalation (*morti* instead of *hosti*) is subsequently clarified as a principle of thought throughout, for example, when Scaeva accuses his people of lacking *pietas* because they cowardly wish to withdraw from the *cumuli virorum* and the *busta* (153f.). He is filled with the thought of a spectacular death, attributes *amor mortis* to himself and starting at 170 embarks on a killing spree that makes for one of the most repulsive passages in ancient literature. Scaeva first fights from atop the wall, then leaps into the hostile mass and as *non fragilis pro Caesare murus* (201) even holds out against the Pompeian counteroffensive. Everything within reach becomes a weapon, be it a beam of wood, a rock or his own body.

The growing number of slain enemies directly correlates to Scaeva's own destruction. His progressive destruction is documented in ever new moments characterized by paradox and hyperbole. His bared internal organs, it is said at 194, are only protected by the spears stuck side-by-side in his chest.[30] When an archer hits his left eye, he pulls out the recalcitrant iron tip together with the nerve strands and tramples the projectile together with the attached eyeball under foot.[31]

Down to the very last detail, his physical destruction is strongly reminiscent of the torture of Marius Gratidianus in 2.173-193. There, too, astonishment is voiced (from the mouth of the narrating veteran) over how many wounds one body can endur without them resulting in death (186f.). Both victims not only lose their eyesight but also their eyes, both of their faces are disfigured beyond recognition, etc.[32]

---

30 Sklenář 2003: 52 sees in this hyperbolic image a deliberate trumping of the heroes of the *Iliad*.

31 Esposito 1995: 68f. compares this scene with two single combat scenes in Ovid's Battle of the Centaurs against the Lapiths in *met.* 12.268-270 and 390-392, but summarizes: "L'orrore della rappresentazione è innegabile, ma sembra esaurirsi al livello dell'espressione, è tutto affidato al gioco delle riprese formali e del loro concatenarsi."

32 Eyes: 2.183f. and 6.217-219; disfiguration of the face: 2.191 and 6.224-226. For the tragic *rhesis* and Homer's *Iliad* as intertextual models for the Marius Gratidianus episode, see the article of Ambühl in this volume.

There are also close parallels to the theatrical suicide of the Vulteius troop on the raft (4.402-581), as Esposito has convincingly shown.[33] The only, but striking, difference seems to be how both men end up: Although the actions of both Caesarians are guided by *amor mortis*, Scaeva's dying, unlike that of Vulteius and his troops, does not ultimately end in his death, but rather in his survival and apparent recovery, which the reader explicitly learns later in the epic – if he doesn't already know it from history – upon Scaeva's reappearance in 10.542-546. Why does Lucan not supply his reader with this information at the end of Scaeva's *aristeia*? Because, in my opinion, this circumstance proves to be irrelevant in terms of the aesthetic implication of the episode. The question whether there is life or death at the end is not posed, because death, as Metger 1957 emphasizes, "[ist] nicht das Ergebnis, sondern [...] seine Voraussetzung. Das Kampfgeschehen gewinnt erst in dem Augenblick klare Gestalt, da der Held auf verlorenem Posten steht und mit todesmutiger Haltung um letzte Bewährung ringt [...]."[34] The focus rests on the process of dying; but here, dying is not simply the transition from life to death but also an independent, artificially-expanded special condition of human existence.

Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in his aesthetic essay „Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet" (1769) deals with the imagination and presentation of death in ancient Greek and Roman culture. He argues:

> Totsein hat nichts Schreckliches; und insofern Sterben nichts als der Schritt zum Totsein ist, kann auch das Sterben nichts Schreckliches haben. Nur so und so sterben, eben jetzt, in dieser Verfassung, nach dieses oder jenes Willen, mit Schimpf und Marter sterben, kann schrecklich werden und wird schrecklich. Aber ist es sodann das Sterben, ist es der Tod, welcher den Schrecken verursacht? Nichts weniger: der Tod ist von allen diesen Schrecken das erwünschte Ende, und es ist nur der Armut der Sprache zuzurechnen, wenn sie beide diese Zustände, den Zustand, welcher unvermeidlich in den Tod führt, und den Zustand des Todes selbst, mit einem und eben demselben Wort benennt.[35]

Lessing wrote his essay, however, under the faulty premise that the Greeks and Romans, unlike the Christians, had representated death not as hostile and macabre, but rather euphemistically and „mit versöhnlichen Zügen" – as in a youth bearing an inverted extinguished torch or as sleep's twin brother.[36] If he was correct in insisting on the difference between dying

33 Esposito 1995: 69f. and Esposito 2001: *passim*. Cf., however, Fantham in this volume p. 68-70

34 Metger 1957: 177.

36 The entire essay is a polemic reaction to the criticism by the antiquity scholar C.A. Klotz of Lessing's "Laokoon", published in 1766, in which he already ex-

and death and considered the process of dying more frightening than death itself, he was certainly not thinking of Lucan: What would Lessing have said to this Scaeva scene?[37]

Lucan seems to have built exactly on a "so oder so" differentiation of dying that constitutes the terror and non-terror of death in his aesthetic conception and seems to have decided for an aesthetic of terror. He expands the moment between life and death to an interval of its own, gives dying its own – at times remarkably stable – state and subdivides it into different phases, which he in turn individually makes into an issue. That which the corpse reawakened by Erictho voices with the advice: Properate textitmori! (Lucan. 6.807) and which he has learned the hard way, hold's true in Lucan's epic: In times of war death is a gift that is not given to everyone.[38]

Another aspect is added to the expansion of the interval between life and death. Particularly in passages in which dying occurs in masses or at least in large numbers, Lucan applies a special "choreography of dying" that is best described using the means of movie dramaturgy often found in disaster and horror movies.[39] For one, Lucan changes the perspective particularly rapidly, illuminating the situation in short sequence from the perspectives of the protagonist, his victim and the narrator. Furthermore, Lucan intensifies the reader's involvement by narrowing and expanding the perspective, such as in a movie that alternates between detail and the

---

presses similar views on antiquity's representations of death. That he then persisted with this view, earned him considerable criticism from J.G. Herder, amongst others. He accused Lessing of contravening his own maxims established in "Laokoon", namely of mixing features from Greek archaic poetry together with Roman sculpture from the emperor's time. Herder, Johann Gottfried (1774). 'Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet? Ein Nachtrag zu Lessings Abhandlung desselben Titels und Inhalts', in Günter Arnold et al. (ed.) (1994), *Johann Gottfried Herder. Werke in zehn Bänden. Vol. 4: Schriften zu Philosophie, Literatur, Kunst und Altertum 1774-1787. Ed. by Jürgen Brummack and Martin Bollacher.* Frankfurt a.M. (Bibl. deutscher Klassiker 195). 579-630.

37 For Lessing's use of Statius, see the very good article by Klodt, Claudia (2002). 'Ein trauriges Bild. Zum Motto von Lessings Abhandlung „Wie die Alten den Tod gebildet" und zu einem weiteren Statiuszitat im Laokoon', A&A 48: 133-154. See also Kämpfer, F. (1994). 'Wie die Alten das Gerippe gebildet. Von Lessing zu Petronius und wieder zurück bis in die Gegenwart', *Laverna* 5: 233-252.

38 Cf. also the apostrophe of the narrator to the reawakened corpse in 6.724f.: *A miser, extremum cui mortis munus inique /eripitur, non posse mori.* The gift of death here consists of a paradox emphasis that the deceased can no more die, that is, he needs no longer "live through" the tormenting agony. cf. Martindale 1976: 46.

39 For more on this topic cf. in general Meteling, Arno (2006). *Monster. Zu Körperlichkeit und Medialität in modernen Horrorfilmen.* Bielefeld.

panorama in a rapid series of cuts. This style is particularly noticable in the naval battle of Massilia (3.567-751). He continuously lets the narrator's perspective oscillate between mass scenes and individual scenes with his narrating camera moving from whole ships to individual hands and fingers and then back again, resting at times for no more than two sentences on an individual fate.

Scaeva's combat, too, is designed according to this type of choreography, especially in the first phase, the *promachia* (6.169-188). First, the camera's view is directed at the entire mass. Scaeva buries the charging enemies under corpses. Then the perspective narrows to the weapons themselves: *ruinae, robora, moles, sudis, contus* – and eventually also Scaeva's own body. Finally, the camera zooms in so closely that only individual body parts are visible: severed hands, a smashed-in skull with bones, a splattered brain.

With Scaeva's leap off the wall into the attackers (180-183), the angle once again expands to the entire scene: Scaeva is surrounded by a large number of enemies, fighting 'one against all.' Again the camera zooms in a bit, viewing swords, projectiles and spears. At the end of the scene, we once more find a close-up of body parts: the temples chafed by crumpled fragments of his helmet, his vitals grotesquely protected by spears sticking into his bones.

Thus there are two narrative principles with which the special effect of this scene is achieved. For one, there is the oscillating 'zoom' between the most minute detail and the overall scene and, for another, there is the contrast between its good, formal structure and the content of a "massacre apocalyptique."[40]

Moreover, Scaeva's own destruction is flanked by a whole series of fates of the other combatants that engage the entire spectrum from living, dead and even undead in hyperbolic escalation. Charging enemies are buried under mountains of corpses so that in a sense they are killed by the dead. Finally, there are so many that these heaps of bodies create a link between the crest of the wall and the ground (*cumulo crescente cadavera murum /admovere solo* 180f.).[41] It should be noted that here *cadavera* is understood as a subject that is actively engaged in the battle. However, compared to Scaeva, the other fates clearly remain in the background – which is evident last but not least by how quickly they die.

40 Franchet d'Espèrey 2004: 38.

41 Hübner 1975: 210 shows how Lucan plays with the reader's anticipation. The imagined movement that is directed upward by *cumulo crescente* is inverted by *murum admovere solo*; the mountains of corpses do not grow to the crest of the wall but rather allow it to seem as if the wall is sinking into the ground.

3. Conclusion

In Lucan, Scaeva becomes a paradigm – but not for heroic *virtus* worthy of emulation, as is offered by the epic *aristeia*, and for which he had been canonized for decades in exempla collections. Using the '*exemplum* trap,' Lucan hands this tradition a subtle poetological rejection. Instead, he presents Scaeva as the representative of a new concept: In a stroke of rhetorical brilliance, he introduces with Scaeva a fascinating choreography of physical destruction by showing the aesthetisization of dying through an artificial and artistic expansion of the interval between life and death. Scaeva is the epitome of the dissolution of the previously applicable basic human conditions of 'dead' and 'alive.' First, this 'hero' is not portrayed and thematized as living but rather exclusively as dying. Second, his dying is exaggerated beyond all human experience through its division into phases – the linguistically and visually powerful images and the sequencing of abstruse, clearly fatal wounds – which, third, are not even followed by death as a release! With this reasoning in mind, Scaeva's reappearance in Book 10 looks like the return of the undead.

However, this is not the only link that can be extended to other passages of the epic. On the basis of an more detailed analysis, which is not possible within the framework of this essay, it could be shown, for example, that already from the very beginning of Book 6 Scaeva is explicitly envisioned as the culmination point. In such an analysis, once should take into account the threatening topography of the cliff promontory and the siege wall, the dramatized authorial assessment of the situation (61-63) and the motival focus on the choreography of death in the immediately preceding description of the plague which affects first horses and afterwards the Pompeian soldiers (80-105).

Furthermore, the aesthetisization of dying is by no means finished with Scaeva, for he is then followed by Erictho, who again recollects he complex of 'dying/dead/undead' – but this time not from the side of a living person who is heading towards death but rather from the other side, that of a dead man being called back to life.[42]

Added to this are varied motival, stylistic, vocabulary and dramaturgical references linking the Scaeva episode with other scenes of combat and death in the epic, for example, with the torturing of Marius Gratidianus in Book 2, in particular sections of the naval battle of Massilia in Book 3 and with the suicide of the Vulteius troop in Book 4. The example of Scaeva, which has been introduced here, shows a specific example of what is in my opinion a fundamental aspect of Lucan's overall concept of the epic: the emphasis on human dying as an independent phase of human ex-

42 Cf. Hömke 2006.

istence and the problematization of its hitherto valid moral implications. However, it is not about presenting the moment of the "final, everlasting freedom."[43] This would require a posture of stoic (i.e. optimistic) expectation by the actors which, in my opinion, is not recognizable as a consistent principle in Lucan's epic. The decisive point is that Lucan again and again brings dying painfully back into awareness – regardless of whether dying is the result of self-determined or frenzied action, whether it is against the victim's will under torments, or whether it is completed by death or is extended by being undead or continuing to live. The period of positive moral *exempla* appears to be over.

43 Rutz 1960: 465-467.

plus quam visibilia – Lukans suggestive Nichtbeschreibungen

CLAUDIA WICK

D.M. Hansueli Hügi

Das Verständnis, aber auch das Missverständnis von Lukans Dichtung hängt entscheidend damit zusammen, ob man einen Zugang zu ihrer Rhetorik findet oder nicht. Ganz sicher besteht ihr Ziel nicht darin, Glaubwürdigkeit zu schaffen. Lukans Zeitgenossen erschien die Beschreibung der zur Sintflut aufgebauschten Überschwemmung in Spanien oder des gigantischen Seesturms in der Adria gewiss nicht realistischer als uns Heutigen. Gleiches gilt vom „tollen Wirbel atmosphärischer und sonstiger Unglücksprodigien [...], der, wenn er wirklich auch nur annähernd ähnlich aufgetreten wäre, damals bestimmt auch den aufgeklärtesten Jenseitsleugner zu schleuniger Umkehr bestimmt haben würde" (Thierfelder 1934: 56 im Bezug auf Lucan. 7,151-184). Die gewaltsame Übersteigerung und die superlativischen Pathosformeln wurden im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert zunehmend zum Stolperstein der Lukaninterpretation, weil man das nötige Verständnis für diese nunmehr als unnatürlich empfundene Ausdrucksform nicht mehr ohne Weiteres aufbrachte. Die klassizistische Abwertung all dessen, was ‚rhetorisch' und ‚deklamatorisch' war, gipfelte letztlich im Verdikt ‚Dekadenz'. Erst durch Untersuchungen zu Natur und Funktion des Pathos wurden wieder Zugänge zu Lukans Dichtung eröffnet. Mehr oder weniger deutlich stand dabei entweder deren Rehabilitation oder die Verknüpfung mit der Frage nach Lukans politischer Parteinahme im Vordergrund.

Beides spielt heute kaum mehr eine Rolle, doch Lukans Rhetorik steht nach wie vor im Mittelpunkt der aktuellen Lukanforschung. Dem Pathosbegriff begegnet man freilich selten, was bedauerlich ist: Es würde sich nämlich lohnen, diesen Ansatz aufzugreifen und an so manche erhellende Einzelbeobachtung anzuknüpfen. Pathos und Phantastik gehören ja zweifellos zu den wichtigsten Merkmalen von Lukans epischer Technik. Wenig untersucht ist nach wie vor die eigentümliche Art der Szenengestaltung mittels Rückgriff auf traditionelle epische Motive, wobei Lukan diese so radikal umgestaltet, dass man kaum weiß, ob man das Resultat eher als

Kombination oder als Substitution betrachten soll. So tritt etwa an die Stelle der vielköpfigen Hydra aus der Fabelwelt ein Knäuel von libyschen Giftschlangen, und die Rolle der einpeitschenden Furie übernehmen im ersten Buch Curio (1,273-291) und der *primipilus* Laelius (1,359-386), um nur zwei Beispiele zu nennen. Diese Technik lässt sich analytisch oft von rhetorischen Stilmitteln kaum trennen, denn auch sie dient mithin der Verfremdung und Überhöhung des Realen (oder besser des ‚Banalen'?). Was die sprachliche Seite betrifft, so erzielt Lukan Steigerungen sowohl quantitativ (nämlich durch Häufungen, Aufzählungen, Variieren eines Elements usw.) als auch qualitativ (durch Hyperbeln, Superlative usw.). Gemeinsam ist all diesen Mitteln naturgemäß, dass sie einer realitätsnahen Darstellung wenig förderlich, im Gegenteil eher hinderlich sind, was gerade bei einem realhistorischen Gegenstand wie dem Römischen Bürgerkrieg zu spannenden künstlerischen Verformungen führen muss.

Als Einstieg in dieses Thema soll die Frage dienen, wie Lukan mit ganz konkreten Gegenständen umgeht. Von jeher haben die Epiker viel Mühe darauf verwendet, möglichst detaillierte und anschauliche *ekphraseis* zu gestalten. Ausgerechnet Lukan, der ja die für die epische Handlung benötigten Landschaften und Örtlichkeiten gar nicht zu erfinden brauchte, attestierte man aber schon oft, seine Beschreibungen seien auffallend diffus, farblos, ja direkt unanschaulich.

Die Darstellungen von Kunstgegenständen und Architektur hat F. L. Bastet untersucht, der etwas perplex feststellt, dass es an kaum einer Stelle bei Lukan plastische Beschreibungen gebe; vielmehr erwähne der Dichter Bauwerke und Artefakte nur flüchtig, um sie sogleich als Ausdruck von Luxus, *ambitus* und Dekadenz zu geißeln (Bastet 1970: 127). Dieser moralisierende Tonfall ist bekanntlich in der römischen Literatur weit verbreitet; er kann, aber er muss nicht mit dem Stoizismus in Zusammenhang stehen. Für die hier interessierende Frage weitaus ergiebiger sind etwa die Beobachtungen Bastets zu Lukans Beschreibung jener verschwenderischen Pracht, die in Kleopatras Palast herrscht (Lucan. 10,111-126):

> Ce qui frappe dans cette *énumération*, c'est que Lucain décrit à peine des objets d'art, mais, bien plutôt, n'a d'yeux que pour ce qu'il y a d'ostentatoire dans la décoration de ce palais: nous voudrions aussi voir de belles peintures, des sculptures impressionnantes, mais il n'y a pour ainsi dire pas un seul vers où l'on ne nomme une matière précieuse ... Mais ce qui nous *frappe par son absence, c'est la figuration*: il n'est pas question de la moindre description nous permettant de donner une *forme* à tout ce qui est énuméré. (Bastet 1970: 141); Hervorhebungen durch Verf.

Weiters wird festgehalten: „chez Lucain [...] règne un manque constant de précision dans la peinture des événements, tandis que le caractère blâ-

mable en est souligné", und in dieselbe Richtung weist die Bemerkung: „Lucain et son propre jugement restent constamment perceptibles au-dessus de récit" (ebda. 143).

Obgleich Bastets Beobachtungen sich auf ein eng definiertes Spezialthema beziehen, berühren sie etwas sehr Wesentliches. Zu ganz ähnlichen Feststellungen gelangen nämlich auch Studien, die Lukans Pathos zum Gegenstand haben. So kam beispielsweise Konrad Seitz nach dem Vergleich von Crastinus' Lanzenwurf (Lucan. 7,470-474) mit Pandaros' Pfeilschuss (Hom. *Il.* 4,122-126) und Tolumnius' Speerwurf (Verg. *Aen.* 12,266-268) zu folgendem Schluss: „Von dem konkreten Vorgang [...] gibt Lucan nur eine blasse, allgemeine Vorstellung; um so schärfer aber erfasst er die Verwerflichkeit der Tat"(Seitz 1965: 219). Zusammenfassend meint er: „Der Erzähler bleibt im lukanischen Epos ständig mit dem eigenen Urteil an der Oberfläche seiner Erzählung sichtbar; die konkrete Schilderung tritt gegenüber dem Bestreben, die für die Wertung wichtigen Aspekte herauszustellen, gänzlich zurück" (ebda. 232).

Dass Lukan Ereignisse und Handlungen eigentlich nicht erzählt, sondern sie lieber interpretiert und bewertet, fällt jedem Leser auf (man vergleiche etwa das Prooemium des *Bellum civile* mit dem der *Aeneis*). Anstatt objektive Distanz zu wahren und die Dinge in anschaulicher Schilderung aus sich selbst heraus wirken zu lassen, lässt Lukan sie zunächst auf sich wirken, bricht sie an seinem Empfinden und vermittelt eine stark stilisierte, höchst subjektive, in der Regel emotionsgeladene Sicht. Sein Epos will gelesen sein „so, dass weithin alles Objektive dem Subjektiven untergeordnet erscheint; miterlebend, mitgerissen und auch wieder eingreifend in den bewegten Gang seiner Worte ist der Sprechende immer mit gegenwärtig" (Klingner 1956: 50).

Gemeinsam ist den Beschreibungen von Gegenständen und Handlungen, dass Lukan kaum Anhaltspunkte dafür gibt, was wir sehen, sondern wie wir es zu betrachten haben. Anders ausgedrückt heißt das: Sein Augenmerk gilt nicht der Form, der Oberfläche und überhaupt der Objektivität des sachlich Richtigen, sondern dem darunter verborgenen Inhalt, der einen Eindruck erzeugt oder sich für eine – subjektive – Deutung anbietet. Ein Dichter, der diese Innenseite der Dinge hervorkehren will, strebt in seiner Darstellung nicht nach gegenständlicher Anschaulichkeit, sondern nach Suggestivkraft und Intensität. Die konkrete und die rhetorische *enargeia* dürften einander wohl weitgehend ausschließen: Eine klare visuelle Nachvollziehbarkeit würde nämlich den Interpretationsspielraum stark einengen oder vielleicht sogar auf Null reduzieren, wogegen eine unscharfe, schwer fassbare Darstellung ihn entsprechend vergrößert. Man kann sich daher fragen, ob jemand, der mit expressiven rhetorischen *colores* malt, nicht ohnehin bewusst darauf hinarbeiten *muss*, die konkrete Vorstellungs-

kraft seines Lesers möglichst wenig zu bedienen bzw. sie komplett zu überfordern. Zu den sprachlichen Mitteln, die sich hierzu am besten eignen, gehören die (bereits erwähnte) Hyperbel, die pointierte Zuspitzung, und vor allem das Paradoxon, das die ‚Realien' in ganz ungewöhnliche, scheinbar unlogische, völlig unerwartete Zusammenhänge stellt.

Den beabsichtigten Effekt können solche Stilmittel freilich nur erzielen, solange sie nicht ‚geerdet' sind: Sobald ein nüchterner Leser sich die ihm präsentierten Dinge nämlich visuell vorzustellen beginnt, offenbart sich ihr Widersinn, manchmal auch ihre tatsächliche Banalität. Man kann natürlich versuchen, das Geschilderte logisch zu analysieren; jedoch sei die Frage gestattet, ob dies wirklich die Reaktion ist, die Lukan sich bei seinem Publikum wünscht. Die Antwort hierauf hat unmittelbare Konsequenzen für die Einschätzung von Lukans Kunstwollen: Pathos und Karikatur bedienen sich nämlich nahezu derselben formalen Mittel, namentlich der Übersteigerung. Aber während das Pathos die Dinge erweitert, um sie mit zusätzlichen Inhalten und Bedeutung zu füllen, bläht die Karikatur sie auf, um die Leere des Hohlraumes zur Geltung zu bringen. Man erkennt in diesem Gegensatz unschwer Positionen, die in neuerer Zeit bei der Interpretation von Lukans Rhetorik vertreten werden. Der Schwachpunkt der sogenannten Dekonstruktion liegt genau darin, dass sie Pathos und Karikatur gleichsetzt und nun glaubt, überall ‚nackte Kaiser' zu sehen. Kunst wie diejenige von Lukan sollte nicht radikal von der pathetischen Überhöhung und provozierenden Stilisierung – kurz: von der gewollten Künstlichkeit – getrennt werden und an moderner Nüchternheit gemessen werden. Eine dergestalt entkernte Hülle muss zwangsläufig hohl wirken. Doch wie auch immer man zur Lukan-Dekonstruktion steht: Als Interpretationsphänomen betrachtet, weist selbst sie auf die zentrale Rolle hin, welche die eigentümliche rhetorische Stilisierung in Lukans Poetik innehat.

Über die Paradoxa und Hyperbeln wurde schon vieles gesagt, deshalb sollen hier nur zwei Beispiele angefügt werden. Das erste ist, auch als Hommage an Heinrich Schliemann, Patron des Rostocker Instituts für Altertumswissenschaften, der Troja-Episode entnommen (Lucan. 9,964-969):

> circumit [sc. Caesar] exustae nomen memorabile Troiae
> magnaque Phoebei quaerit vestigia muri. 965
> iam silvae steriles et putres robore trunci
> Assaraci pressere domos et templa deorum
> iam lassa radice tenent, ac tota teguntur
> Pergama dumetis: etiam periere ruinae.

Die Verse 965-969 bieten ein trostloses, aber konkret vorstellbares Bild eines weit fortgeschrittenen Zerfalls. Die Zerstörung Trojas wird durch

eine sorgfältig aufgebaute Steigerung richtiggehend potenziert: Zunächst wurde die Stadt niedergebrannt (*exustae* |...| *Troiae*); dann verschwanden die Trümmer mit der Zeit spurlos (*quaerit vestigia*), oder sie wurden von Bäumen und Gestrüpp überwuchert. Doch auch dieses ist mittlerweile schon tot und morsch geworden (*steriles, putres*; vgl. auch *lassa radice*). Die Quintessenz der ganzen Versreihe verdichtet sich in der abschließenden Sentenz *etiam periere ruinae*: Steigerung (*etiam*), Potenzierung (*periere ruinae*), Unvorstellbarkeit durch Paradoxon. Sachlich ist es zwar möglich und normal, dass eine Ruine weiterzerfällt, aber sprachlich entsteht ein Kurzschluss, wenn etwas Zerstörtes zerstört wird.

Gleiches gilt für den Zustand eines Körpers, der von *seps*-Gift zerfressen und aufgelöst wird (Lucan. 9,767-769):

> nam plagae proxima circum
> fugit rupta cutis pallentiaque ossa retexit;
> iamque sinu laxo nudum sine corpore volnus.

Interessant ist die Schlussformulierung *sinu laxo nudum sine corpore volnus*. Die umgekehrte Formulierung, *totum est pro volnere corpus* (9,814) ist vorstellbar: der Körper als eine einzige riesige Wunde. Aber *nudum sine corpore volnus* – notabene die Umkehr der ovidischen Klausel *sine vulnere corpus* (Ov. *met.* 12,99; 13,267) – ist eine Verletzung, die in fleischlosem Nichts hängt. Eine pointiertere Art, die Wirkung des auflösenden *seps*-Giftes zu beschreiben, gibt es nicht. Sachlich gemeint ist das durch Fäulnis entstandene Loch im Gewebe (*sinu laxo*), und dieses fleischlose Loch ist sehr wohl eine Wunde. Eine fleischlose Wunde ist aber eine schlechterdings nicht mehr vorstellbare Sprachkonstruktion.

Es ist bemerkenswert, dass dieses zweite Beispiel aus einer Beschreibung von Verletzungen stammt. Bei der Darstellung von Leiden und Sterben verfällt Lukan bekanntermaßen in das Extrem des Hyperrealismus und schockiert mit kruder Detailversessenheit. Über mangelnde Anschaulichkeit wird sich kein Leser der zahlreichen einschlägigen Stellen beschweren! Doch auch hier lässt sich beobachten, wie klein der Schritt über die Grenze des Vorstellbaren hinaus sein kann. Der Hyperrealismus soll hier aber nicht weiter thematisiert werden (es sei stattdessen auf den Beitrag von Nicola Hömke verwiesen); es bleibt lediglich festzuhalten, dass er nicht den Gegensatz, sondern das ergänzende Gegenstück zur Unanschaulichkeit darstellt, gleichsam als Kehrseite derselben Medaille.

Das Trojabeispiel hat gezeigt, dass Lukan in der Lage ist, selbst einer statischen Ortsbeschreibung überraschende Seiten abzugewinnen. Aber solche Pointen reichen nicht aus, um aus den Schauplätzen des Bürgerkriegs, die den Römern längst bekannt waren, ‚poetische Landschaften' zu machen. Ein Dichter, der beispielsweise ein historisches Epos über Alexanders Indienfeldzug schreibt, konnte immerhin auf die Exotik der fernen

Länder zurückgreifen. Mehr noch: Die berühmte Episode von Alexander am Rand des Ozeans eignet sich hervorragend für eine dichterische Gestaltung. Gibt es Land jenseits des Ozeans, den berühmten *alter orbis*? Wie gefährlich ist der Ozean, dessen Naturgewalt die Soldaten bereits erfahren haben? Wir wissen – unter anderem dank der 1. Suasorie bei Seneca dem Älteren –, dass dieses Thema in der Deklamatorenschule gerne behandelt wurde. Wo Menschen bekannte Gegenden verlassen und ins Unbekannte vorstoßen, treffen sie auf Neues und Ungewohntes, und die fremde Wirklichkeit, die sie vorfinden, kann so phantastisch wirken wie eine Märchenwelt.

Ein solcher Ausgangspunkt bot sich Lukan freilich von vornherein nirgends, nicht einmal für Libyen, wenn man von den berüchtigten Giftschlangen absieht. Das Innere Afrikas war zwar *terra incognita* und im sprichwörtlichen Sinne immer für eine Überraschung gut (vgl. Plin. *nat.* 8,42 *vulgare Graeciae dictum: ‚semper aliquid novi Africam adferre'*), aber für Nordafrika galt dies längst nicht mehr. Den Dichter hätte dies freilich nicht zu stören brauchen: Lukan hätte die nüchterne, auf einer alten Geographenkontroverse beruhende Einleitungsfrage seiner Libyenbeschreibung (9,411-413), nämlich ob Afrika zu Asien oder zu Europa gehöre, rhetorisch aufbauschen und Cato durch eine Weltgegend ziehen lassen können, von der noch nicht einmal die rudimentärsten Gegebenheiten gesichert sind. Vom märchenhaften *alter orbis* würde sie sich nur insofern unterscheiden, als zumindest ihre Existenz gesichert ist. Lukan lässt diese Möglichkeit jedoch ungenutzt und breitet eine relativ prosaische Topographie vor dem Leser aus, wie man sie oft bei Historikern findet (etwa bei Polybios, vgl. vor allem 3,36f.). Freilich greift er hier auf etwas zurück, was als Alternative zur Darstellung wirklich exotischer Gegenden dienen kann, nämlich die Beschreibung einer bekannten Landschaft, wie sie sich in längst vergangener Zeit präsentierte. Seine nordafrikanischen Völker leben noch immer ziemlich primitiv und von der Welt weitgehend abgeschieden. Ab Vers 9,424 driftet die Digression in Ideal- und Moralethnologie inklusive der bei Lukan häufigen, schon erwähnten Luxuskritik ab.

Dieses Beispiel deutet bereits an, welchen Weg Lukan einzuschlagen hatte – er musste Topographie und Topothesie kombinieren (zum Unterschied vgl. Serv. *Aen.* 1,159 *topothesia est* |...| *fictus secundum poeticam licentiam locus* |...|; *topographia est rei verae descriptio*). Hierfür gibt es mehrere Möglichkeiten. Die einfachste besteht darin, *mirabilia* aller Art zu beschreiben, eine ebenfalls in Deklamatorenschulen praktizierte Übung (vgl. Sen. *contr.* 2 *praef.* 3 *suasoriis aptior erat* |sc.*Fabianus*|: *locorum habitus fluminumque decursus et urbium situs moresque populorum nemo de-*

scripsit abundantius). Die Natur lieferte genügend ‚wunderbare' Themen, die sich mit etwas rhetorischem Geschick attraktiv beschreiben ließen.

Mit den Syrten, die Cato durchquerte, stand Lukan eine ungewöhnliche, wahrhaft paradoxe Landschaft zu Gebote (9,303-318): Denn diese Gegend war wegen ihrer Untiefen und der – im Mittelmeer sonst fast unbekannten – Gezeitenwirkung gefürchtet. Lukan greift das Motiv des täglich tobenden Kampfes zwischen Meer und Land auf (übrigens auch dies ein Lieblingsthema der Deklamatoren), verlegt das Ringen der Naturkräfte aber auf eine tektonische Ebene. Und so entsteht vor dem Leser eine urtümliche Szenerie, vergleichbar mit Vulkanlandschaften, in denen der Schöpfungsprozess ebenfalls noch nicht abgeschlossen ist. Hier erscheint auch das *dubium*-Motiv (das deshalb hundert Verse später nicht schon wieder verwendet werden konnte): Die Syrten sind eine unfertige Gegend, die von der Natur keine Gestalt (*figuram*, v. 303) erhalten haben, sondern im Schwebezustand zwischen Meer und Erde belassen wurden (*in dubio pelagi terraeque reliquit*, v. 304). Die zwitterhafte Gegend (*ambigua |...| lege loci |...| sedes*, v. 307) lässt sich gar nicht richtig definieren, geschweige denn eindeutig beschreiben: *aequora fracta vadis abruptaque terra profundo* (v. 308).

Unverkennbar ist der stark ovidische Einschlag dieser Stelle: Das Nebeneinander von ‚weder – noch' und ‚sowohl – als auch' (bzw. ‚nicht mehr – noch nicht') gleicht einer Momentaufnahme aus den *Metamorphosen*. Vor allem aber wird man an Ovids Beschreibungen von Mischwesen erinnert, die oft *ambiguus, dubius, mixtus* oder Doppelformulierungen enthalten. Ein Paradebeispiel hierfür sind die vier Beschreibungen des Minotaurus: *tauri mixtaque forma viri* (Ov. *epist.* 2,70), *parte virum |...|, parte bovem* (epist. 10,102), *letum taurique virique* (10,127), schließlich der Pentameter *semibovemque virum, semivirumque bovem* (*ars* 2,24), auf den Ovid besonders stolz war (vgl. Sen. *contr.* 2,2,12). Vergleichbar ist auch die Beschreibung der etwas androgynen Atalante: (*faciem*) *virgineam in puero, puerilem in virgine* (Ov. *met.* 8,323).

Die Besonderheiten von Lukans Syrtenbeschreibung macht ein Vergleich mit derjenigen in den *Argonautika* des Apollonios Rhodios deutlich (4,1237-1249). Dort wird sehr anschaulich eine triste Einöde mit endloser Sandwüste, diesiger Luft und schaumbedecktem Algenwasser beschrieben, welche die Argonauten gleich nach ihrem Schiffbruch verzweifeln lässt. Hermann Fränkel bemerkt zur Libyenepisode des Apollonios: „die 400 Verse |...| sind durchsetzt mit Zügen, die für Nordafrika charakteristisch sind" (Fränkel 1968: 593). Davon kann bei Lukan nicht die Rede sein.

Eine weitere Möglichkeit besteht darin, jene Eigenschaften einer Gegend auszugestalten, die auf die dort sich abspielenden Geschehnisse bzw. auf die handelnden Personen Einfluss ausüben. Das können topographi-

sche oder klimatische Besonderheiten sein, aber auch einzelne (punktuelle) Naturereignisse. Leicht kann der Eindruck erzeugt werden, dass sich die örtliche Natur entweder freundlich oder feindlich verhält, ähnlich wie es im mythologischen Epos beispielsweise Fluss- oder Windgötter und Nymphen tun (vgl. die Sintflut in Spanien, Lucan. 4,48ff.). Es bedarf keines großen sprachlichen Aufwands, um den gewünschten Effekt zu bewirken: Es genügt, die Natur oder eine Gegend als handelndes Satzsubjekt zu zeigen und ihr positive oder negative Beiwörter zu verleihen. In längeren Episoden kann aus den sich immer wieder, dauerhaft bemerkbar machenden Charakteristika einer Gegend eine Art ‚Verhaltensmuster' konstruiert werden.

Lukans Libyen zeigt zwei hervorstechende Merkmale: Zum einen mangelt es dem Land wegen des losen Sandes an Festigkeit, zum anderen erweist es sich immer wieder als ‚Schwarzes Loch', das alles verschlucken und dann nicht mehr hergeben will. Diese zweite Eigenschaft wird sogleich bei Catos Abmarsch in die Wüste deutlich (Lucan. 9,408-410):

irreducemque viam deserto limite carpit |sc. Cato|;
et sacrum parvo nomen clausura sepulchro
invasit Libye securi fata Catonis. 410

Man würde eigentlich erwarten, dass Cato Subjekt von *invasit* und Libyen das Objekt ist, weil er doch mit seiner Armee eine Invasion beginnt. Aber zugleich beginnt Libyen, ihn sich einzuverleiben, denn Cato wird in Utica sterben und in afrikanischem Boden begraben werden (daher das einleitende *irreducem* |...| *viam*). So wie Lukan dies formuliert, gewinnt man den Eindruck, dass Cato im Grunde nicht seinem militärischen Gegner Caesar, sondern dem nicht minder feindlichen Libyen unterliegt. Eine allzu bildhafte Darstellung des Verschlingens hat Lukan dadurch vermieden, dass er als Objekt zu *invasit Libye* die *fata Catonis* wählte, nicht *Catonem* allein.

Eine sehr konkrete Methode, Catos Männer nach und nach zu verschlingen, wendet Libyen gleich in der ersten Episode des Marsches an. Der Südwind entfesselt einen fürchterlichen Sandsturm, der manche Soldaten ganz unter den Sandmassen begräbt, andere wiederum werden nur festgehalten, so als steckten sie im Schnee oder Schlamm (Lucan. 9,485-489):

qui super ingentes cumulos involvit harenae 485
atque operit tellure viros: vix tollere miles
membra valet multo congestu pulveris haerens.
alligat et stantes affusae magnus harenae
agger et immoti terra surgente tenentur.

Jedem antiken Leser dürfte bekannt gewesen sein, dass in Nordafrika das Volk der Psyller oder aber das Heer des Kambyses durch solche Stürme komplett vernichtet wurde (vgl. bei Herodot etwa 3,26,3; 4,173). Ob Lukan auch der unheimliche Treibsand, in dem man regelrecht ertrinken kann, bekannt war, lässt sich nicht sagen. Vom Sand förmlich verschluckt werden ebenso der Weg und alle Landmarken, an denen die Marschierenden sich orientieren könnten (*iamque iter omne latet nec sunt discrimina terrae*, 493). Nicht einmal der Himmel ist sicher vor dem Wüten Libyens: Der Horizont verbirgt die – zur Orientierung wichtigen – Sternbilder ganz oder teilweise hinter seiner Krümmung (Lucan. 9,495-497):

nec sidera tota 495
ostendit Libycae finitor circulus orae
multaque devexo terrarum margine celat.

Bei dieser Interpretation erscheint das Schlussstück der Sturmepisode nicht mehr bloß als gelehrte astronomische Zutat, sondern wird Teil eines Motivs, das schon in Vers 462 anklang: *tantus tenet aera pulvis*. Der libysche Staub hat sich himmelwärts erhoben und hält den Luftraum im Griff. Des weiteren hält der Sand auch die Wahrheit bedeckt, nämlich im Orakel von Iuppiter Ammon: (*deus*) *mersit* [...] *hoc pulvere verum?* (9,577). In der mythologischen Erzählung von Antaeus' Kampf mit Herkules saugt Libyen, hier durch Gaia vertreten, gierig den herabrinnenden Schweiß ihres monströsen Sohnes auf (*rapit arida tellus / sudorem*, 4,629f.). Ein letztes Mal erscheint das Motiv in den Schlussversen der Libyenepisode (Lucan. 9,942-945):

iamque illi (sc. Catoni) magis atque magis durescere pulvis
coepit et in terram Libye spissata redire,
iamque procul rarae nemorum se tollere frondes,
surgere congesto non culta mapalia culmo. 945

Libyen, von Lukan bereits als instabile Sandmasse ohne Festigkeit charakterisiert (9,467-471), nimmt jetzt langsam eine dichte, feste Form an, wobei *durescere* und *spissata* an einen kosmogonischen Prozess denken lassen, bei dem die Welt feste Gestalt annimmt (vgl. Manil. 1,161-166). *In terram* [...] *redire* und die am Horizont langsam auftauchenden Bäume und Häuser sind ein Motiv, das aus Sintflutbeschreibungen bekannt ist, vgl. Ov. *met.* 1,343-347 (vor allem *colles* [...] *exire videntur* sowie *surgit humus, crescunt loca decrescentibus undis*) und Lucan. 4,128f. (*tollere silva comas, stagnis emergere colles / incipiunt visoque die durescere valles*). Die sprachliche Gestaltung der oben zitierten Verse ist bemerkenswert: Man gewinnt den Eindruck, dass nicht Cato sich bewegt, sondern der Boden, der sich unter seinen Füßen langsam wieder verfestigt und zugleich das freigibt, was vorher verschluckt war.

Dass dieser unheimliche Erdboden allgemein sehr wenig aus sich hervorgehen lässt, überrascht somit nicht: Die Bedingungen für die Vegetation sind schlichtweg unwirtlich (9,431-434; 438; 857). Fruchtbar ist Libyen nur an Tod und Verderben, was im Zusammenhang mit den Giftschlangen auch explizit gesagt wird (9,619-621). Kaum fällt nach Medusas Enthauptung ein Regen von Monsterblut auf diesen Boden, wachsen sogleich Scharen von todbringenden Schlangen heran (9,700ff.). In Buch 4 hingegen strömen Antaeus aus demselben Boden fortwährend dämonische Kräfte zu, gegen die sich Herkules lange Zeit vergeblich müht (4,643f.).

So verschieden die beiden hier angesprochenen Techniken auch sind: Gemeinsam ist ihnen, dass sie der beschriebenen Natur eine zusätzliche Dimension verleihen, die nicht visuell, sondern ausschließlich emotional wahrnehmbar ist. Der Leser erlebt Libyen als wundersame, urtümliche, unheimliche und sogar böse Landschaft. Der Effekt wäre ein völlig anderer, wenn Lukan bloß die realen Gefahren der Wüste beschrieben hätte, als da wären: *serpens, sitis, ardor, harenae* (9,402). Eine wirklich anschauliche Beschreibung der flimmernden Hitze, des glühenden Sandes und der Einöde mit ihren Dünen gibt es bei Lukan erwartungsgemäß nicht. Wie ein solcher Bericht hätte aussehen können, mag man der dramatischen Darstellung bei Q. Curtius Rufus entnehmen (7,5,1-6):

> ipse [sc. Alexander] cum expedito agmine loca deserta Sogdianorum intrat, nocturno itinere exercitum ducens: aquarum [...] penuria prius desperatione quam desiderio bibendi sitim accendit. per CCCC stadia ne modicus quidem humor existit, harenas vapor aestivi solis accendit; quae ubi flagrare coeperunt, haud secus quam continenti incendio cuncta torrentur. caligo deinde immodico terrae fervore excitata lucem tegit, camporumque non alia quam vasti et profundi aequoris species est. nocturnum iter tolerabile videbatur, quia rore et matutino frigore corpora levabantur. ceterum cum ipsa luce aestus oritur, omnemque naturalem absorbet humorem siccitas; ora visceraque penitus uruntur. itaque primum animi, deinde corpora deficere coeperunt.

Vergleichbare Beschreibungen gibt es beispielsweise bei Diodor (17,49ff.; 20,42,1f.), Strabo (15,2,4-7), Arrian (*An.* 3,29; 6,24-26) und bei Curtius selbst (4,7,9-13).

Die typischen Elemente der Wüstenbeschreibung, wie sie im Curtius-Zitat enthalten sind, erscheinen bei Lukan zwar auch, aber jedes von ihnen wird nur flüchtig skizziert. In der Hauptsache ist das, was der Dichter seinem Publikum vermittelt, eine stilisierte, interpretierte Landschaft, die eher (nach)-empfunden als plastisch gesehen werden soll. Wie er sich das wohl vorstellt, wird dann besonders deutlich, wenn er seine Figuren im Epos ausdrücklich auf die landschaftlichen Gegebenheiten reagieren lässt.

Dies geschieht etwa in der Klagerede der erschöpften Soldaten, die hier in ganzer Länge wiedergegeben sei (Lucan. 9,848-880):

‚reddite, di' clamant, miseris quae fugimus arma,
reddite Thessaliam. patimur cur segnia fata
in gladios iurata manus? pro Caesare pugnant
dipsades et peragunt civilia bella cerastae.
ire libet qua zona rubens atque axis inustus
solis equis; iuvat aetheriis ascribere causis
quod peream, caeloque mori. nil, Africa, de te
nec de te, natura, queror: tot monstra ferentem
gentibus ablatum dederas serpentibus orbem,
impatiensque solum Cereris cultore negato
damnasti atque homines voluisti desse venenis.
in loca serpentum nos venimus: accipe poenas
tu, quisquis superum commercia nostra perosus
hinc torrente plaga, dubiis hinc Syrtibus orbem
abrumpens medio posuisti limite mortes.
per secreta tui bellum civile recessus
vadit, et arcani miles tibi conscius orbis
claustra ferit mundi. forsan maiora supersunt
ingressis: coeunt ignes stridentibus undis
et premitur natura poli; sed longius istac
nulla iacet tellus, quam fama cognita nobis
tristia regna Iubae. quaeremus forsitan istas
serpentum terras: habet hoc solacia caelum:
vivit adhuc aliquid. patriae non arva requiro
Europamque alios soles Asiamque videntem:
qua te parte poli, qua te tellure reliqui,
Africa? Cyrenis etiamnunc bruma rigebat:
exiguane via legem convertimus anni?
imus in adversos axes, evolvimur orbe,
terga damus ferienda Noto; nunc forsitan ipsa est
sub pedibus iam Roma meis. solacia fati
haec petimus: veniant hostes, Caesarque sequatur
qua fugimus.'

Es handelt sich hier um einen Textabschnitt, zu dessen Verständnis einiges Vorwissen notwendig ist. Der Aufbau der Rede orientiert sich nämlich an Deklamationen zum bereits erwähnten Thema ‚Alexander am Ende der Welt'. Zu den häufig wiederkehrenden Elementen in diesen Reden gehören die *transgressio limitum* und die *ingressio in alium orbem*. Das erste Motiv ist älter und stark von religiösen Vorstellungen geprägt: Das Vordringen in unbekannte Welten ist widernatürlich und fordert den Zorn der Götter

heraus. Die Schwierigkeiten und Hindernisse, die sich den Eindringlingen entgegenstellen, werden als Zeichen dieses Zornes interpretiert. Der *alius orbis* wird dementsprechend als lebensfeindlich empfunden: Hier wohnen die seltsamsten Tiere und schrecklichsten Monster, die Natur scheint verrückt zu spielen, und irgendwo droht auch noch der Rand der Welt, zumindest aber die kochenden Fluten, in denen die Sonne versinkt.

Alle diese Elemente kommen in der Soldatenklage vor, die – nüchtern betrachtet – bestenfalls als Demonstration kollektiver Hysterie durchgeht. Die Soldaten ziehen ja nicht quer durch die Wüste, sondern (wie aus 9,756 hervorgeht) mehr oder weniger den Syrten entlang. Lukan konnte der offensichtliche Widerspruch gleichgültig sein: denn die Redner sollen dem ‚zuhörenden' Leser eben keine sachliche Beschreibung der Wüste geben. Nein, sie bringen in diesem Moment ihr Empfinden, ihr Erleben der feindlichen Natur Libyens zum Ausdruck – und die entsetzliche Angst, die sie ihnen bereitet. Die ‚Pathetisierung', d.h. die ‚Erlebbarkeit' einer ganz konkreten Gegebenheit, erreicht hier ihre höchste Stufe: Dieses (imaginäre) Libyen mit seinen überzeichneten Gefahren ist völlig irreal, aber in den Köpfen der Soldaten existiert es sehr wohl.

Die Rede der Soldaten ist auch noch unter einem literaturhistorischen Aspekt interessant. Es lässt sich nämlich zeigen, dass die Idee hinter dem soeben besprochenen Vorgehen nicht von Lukan selbst stammt. In einem bei Seneca dem Älteren (*suas.* 1,15) überlieferten Fragment von Albinovanus Pedo ist sie schon voll ausgeprägt. Pedo hat ebenfalls ein historisches Epos verfasst, und zwar über die Expedition des Germanicus ins nördliche Meer. Diese Gegend macht den Seeleuten nicht weniger Angst als die libysche Wüste den römischen Legionären, aber ihre Angst dürfte um einiges begründeter sein. Anders als Lukan, der ausschließlich die verängstigten Soldaten sprechen läßt, beteiligt sich hier auch der Erzähler an der dramatischen Stilisierung der äußeren Umstände (Albinov. *carm. frg.* 1-23; zitiert nach *FPL* ed. Courtney):

iam pridem post terga diem solemque relictum
iamque vident, notis extorres finibus orbis,
per non concessas audaces ire tenebras
ad rerum metas extremaque litora mundi,
hunc illum, pigris immania monstra sub undis
qui ferat, Oceanum, qui saevas undique pristis
aequoreosque canes, ratibus consurgere prensis
(accumulat fragor ipse metus), iam sidere limo
navigia et rapido desertam flamine classem,
seque feris credunt per inertia fata marinis
iam non felici laniandos sorte relinqui.
atque aliquis prora caecum sublimis ab alta

aera pugnaci luctatus rumpere visu,
ut nihil erepto valuit dinoscere mundo,
obstructo tales effundit pectore voces:
‚quo ferimur? fugit ipse dies orbemque relictum
ultima perpetuis claudit natura tenebris.
anne alio positas ultra sub cardine gentes
atque alium bellis intactum quaerimus orbem?
di revocant rerumque vetant cognoscere finem
mortales oculos. aliena quid aequora remis
et sacras violamus aquas divumque quietas
turbamus sedes'.

Vincenzo Tandoi hat in einem Aufsatz, der sich speziell mit diesem Fragment und der Rhetorik in der julisch-claudischen Epoche beschäftigt, auch den eigentlichen Schlüssel zu Lukans Soldatenrede gefunden, denn für sie gilt (*mutatis mutandis*) das nicht minder, was er über Pedos Rede sagt:

> Quanto di irreale ha lo scenario è lasciato nel vago, senza contorni definiti, ed il vago è ragione prima di spavento [...] Naviganti che poco *vident* e molto più *credunt* hanno già il sole e il mondo alle spalle, fin qui plausibile conseguenza di semplificazioni mentali degli antichi. [...] Il poeta non esclude un fondo di verità e neanche riduce tutto a fenomeni di allucinazione collettiva, ciò che gli preme è dipingerci il crescente terrore dei naviganti in balìa di una natura ignota e ostile [...] Senza propriamente inventare, egli riconnette sul piano fantastico dati di leggende antiche e nuove, mitizzando così un nucleo storico recente (Tandoi 1964: 134).

Dieser letzte Satz beschreibt zutreffend und prägnant auch den Kern von Lukans epischer Technik. Die Mythologie überlässt ihren Platz dem Phantastischen und Imaginären, die aber beide nicht aus frei Erfundenem, sondern aus übersteigerter und verzerrter Realität bestehen (dieselbe Umschreibung passt auch zu manchen Themen der Deklamatorenschule, die bei Lukan nachwirken). Wird Zeitgeschichte mit all den Mitteln, die in diesem Aufsatz erwähnt wurden, stilisiert und vor allem pathetisiert, nimmt sie unweigerlich mythische Dimensionen an.

Medusa, Antaeus, and *Caesar Libycus*[*]

DUNSTAN LOWE

1. Wild and Supernatural Threats in the *Bellum Civile*

"Libya," as Lucan applies the term, includes the entire African continent, from Carthage in the west to Egypt in the east.[1] Focusing on the desert, Matthew Leigh argues in his 2000 article that Libya is a hostile, strange, and fantastical region in the Roman imagination, whose enormous sufferings and pleasures make it an ideal testing-area where Stoic heroes can assert their moral self-control.[2] This is often the case, most obviously for Lucan's Cato, and on such occasions this esoteric territory plays an auxiliary role in the fashioning of the model Roman subject. However, the region is sometimes a great deal more problematic: Erica Bexley argues in this volume, for example, that the figure of Medusa can be read as an equivalent to that of Cato. In what follows, I will argue that although Libya is indeed a wild and threatening place, its threat is not only embodied by snakes and other native Libyan beings. It is also embodied by certain Romans themselves, above all Julius Caesar. Secondly, I will argue that Libya, and places like it, are filled with mythical and supernatural associations which assault the historicity of the narrative, just as a number of historical characters assault Italy and Europe – all of them coming from or through Libya, except Caesar, who ends up there, being left at the end of the poem at Pharos on the Egyptian coast.[3]

* This article has benefited from the helpful comments of participants in the *Internationale Lucan-Tagung* at Rostock University in June 2007.

1 Cf. e.g. Lucan. 3.292-295 (Ammon summons Libya's forces from the *Mauri* at one end to the Syrtes at the other) and 4.734-737 (*Libycae fraudes* and *Punica bella* are used together, implying that Libya includes Carthage).

2 Martindale 1981 argues that Hercules, in fighting Antaeus, provides a Stoic paradigm like that of Cato: Viarre 1982 reads the whole narrative of Cato's desert expedition as a moral allegory.

3 Of course, Caesar too uses the annexation of Egypt as a stepping-stone to power, but outside the time frame of the poem as we have it.

Lucan associates the excessiveness of Libya with that of Caesar. Libya is occasionally compared with other places, and is always 'more', for better or worse: the Nile is bigger than the Padus, yet Libya (specifically, Egypt) is more fertile than Sicily and Sardinia,[4] and the fighting involving Curio occurs as suddenly as that involving Vulteius (4.581-582). Whether Libya is described as barren or fertile, hot or wet, masculine or feminine, it always surpasses Italy and the West. Various similes highlight its natural savagery and destructiveness. Although the simile of the hero as a wild beast is a defining feature of ancient martial epic, Libyan beasts are anti-Republican metaphors. Caesar is a Libyan lion; Scaeva (a surrogate for Caesar) is a Libyan elephant and a Libyan she-bear.[5] At one point in the poem, Pompey is compared to tigresses (1.327-331), which at first glance seems to break the Caesarean alignment of Lucan's animal metaphors, but on closer examination supports it. Tigers are of course not Libyan, but Asian (and specifically Hyrcanian, according to their most common Roman poetic epithet, as used here). Furthermore, at this point Caesar himself is speaking, and therefore other qualifications are possible. Although ancient poets do refer to female *ferae* more often than male *feri*, the choice of gender here may be significant in conjunction with the other half of the simile: Pompey is accused of gaining his crazed taste for blood through the habit of licking Sulla's sword (330-331), an image with pathic as well as bestial (and servile) overtones. Caesar seems to be attributing to Pompey not mere aggression, which according to Roman psychology is masculine, but frenzy driven by uncontrolled desire (*sitis*, 331), which is feminine. In any case, the Libyan beasts are clearly intended to embody the scorching energy of their arid landscape.

The Syrtes are a geographic equivalent to Libya's deadly fauna, especially since, in earlier poems, poetic heroines had combined them with wild animals in the 'inhuman parentage' trope.[6] The Syrtes are frequently mentioned in the poem and even, like the Nile, are made the subject of chorographic digressions.[7] Symbolising ambiguity and deadliness, and well established as a poetic metaphor for heartlessness,[8] the Syrtes are referred to by Caesar himself in Book 5. He tells Antony that there is no excuse for delay in merging his army with Caesar's own, since no Libya

4 Lucan. 2.410-417, 3.68-70. In both cases the narrator makes concessions: the Nile is only the biggest river because it floods over flat sands, and Egypt's crops only barely outperform Sicily and Sardinia.

5 Lucan. 1.205-212, 6.210-211, 6.220-223. On Scaeva as Caesar's surrogate, see Saylor 1978.

6 Catull. 64.154-157; Ps.-Tib. 3.4.84-94; Ov. *met.* 8.119-121.

7 Syrtes: Lucan. 9.303-318, 411-471; Nile: 10.282-331.

8 Cf. Catull. 64.155-157; Ov. *met.* 8.119-121.

with its shifting Syrtes lies between them (5.484-485). The terrain plays the same role as the wildlife: by using the Syrtes as a metaphor, Caesar implies that approaching him might be compared with traversing Libya. Later on, in a simile used by the narrator, his approach makes the Senate flee as if from a shipwreck on the Syrtes (1.498-502). Jamie Masters, in commencing his discussion of Lucan, observes that Caesar repeatedly resembles, or is compared to, Hannibal; that the Caesarean Curio also has many Hannibalic (and Jugurthine) overtones; and that Pompey is characterised by delay, like Hannibal's enemy Fabius Cunctator.[9] Given Lucan's consistent use of animal and geographic metaphors we can go further, and call Caesar's characterisation not only Hannibalic, but Libyan.

The *Bellum Civile* may not have a divine apparatus, but myth remains its frame of reference: it is no accident that its only two mythic narratives are spatially located in the same mysterious continent. In the mouth of an ignorant but faithful narrator, the legend of Hercules and Antaeus in Book 4 is more 'straightforward' than that of Medusa within the account of Cato's desert march in Book 9, but belief in stories is a difficult issue in both episodes and in others in the poem. I will argue that, as a historical epicist portraying a global conflict, Lucan often symbolises the relationship between history and myth as the relationship between 'history-filled' Rome on the one hand, and 'myth-filled' Libya (plus other uncontrollable locations including the Gallic grove in Book 3 and Thessaly in Book 6) on the other.[10] These are the places in the *Bellum Civile* where the supernatural (or at least, the unnatural) resides, both in mythical tradition and immediate reality.

2. Medusa's Snakes

The episode of Lucan's Libyan snakes is one of the most striking in the *Bellum Civile*, a catalogue of carnivalesque bodily distortions without parallel in surviving Roman epic or history. Containing a lengthy adaptation of the Perseus-Medusa story, it is also one of his closest approaches to the use of mythic apparatus. The after-effects of this fictional encounter dictate the meaning of Cato's expedition, which Elaine Fantham has called

9 Masters 1992: 1 n.1.

10 Supernatural places are linked in Lucan, despite geographic distance. Notably, Erictho has somehow got hold of the skin of the Libyan *cerastes* (Lucan. 6.679), perhaps indirectly recalling the incongruous presence of a Libyan bear-skin inside Evander's hut (*Aeneid* 8.368). In Lucan's Thessaly and elsewhere, witches are associated with wildlife, and this includes African snakes (*Canidia* [...] *peior serpentibus Afris*: Hor. *sat.* 2.8.95).

"a new Stoic myth of heroism."[11] In this piece of narrative monstrosity, the avowedly fictional presence of Medusa exerts influence on the 'real' story of Cato's Libyan march. Its protagonists suffer incredibly grotesque deaths, a new and ephemeral set of metamorphoses, in which flesh replaces stone. By examining the character, associations, and ontological status of Lucan's Medusa, we can read the series of Medusan snake-poisonings as the thematic crisis-point of the episode.[12]

When introducing the Medusan origin of Libya's snakes, Lucan conditions his reader's response by calling it a universal misconception (9.619-623). The significance of the episode within the poem's structure is twofold: first, it is a major part of Cato's definition as a Stoic icon, and secondly, it indicates that Lucan seeks to cultivate in his reader a high degree of scepticism about myth, and engagement with it. Fantham notes that, in contrast to Ovid, Lucan avoids giving the divine characters of the myth their Roman names.[13] She interprets this as a distancing tool, marking the passage as separate from the historical Roman context. We might always say, however, that it has the opposite function, actually helping to legitimise the material by avoiding the incongruity of the myth (on the onomastic level) as an insert of Roman history. The presentation of Cato has likewise (at least in recent Anglophone scholarship) been subjected to divergent readings, either as a reinforcement of his 'Stoic saint' persona, or as the subversion of it. Ahl and Morford both take the former view, and both also regard the snake episode as a failure.[14] Bartsch argues, by contrast, that the descriptions of the deaths are deliberately comic and unrealistic, and that Cato's reputation is meant to suffer.[15] The credibility and seriousness of Cato and the snakes is connected with that of myth, in that an undermining of Lucan's own prior construction of Cato (as seen especially in Book 2) is an attack on the plausibility of his historical narrative, taking place within the context of Libya. Book 9 accommodates a reinforcement and an inversion both of Cato's *gravitas*, and at the same time, of the poem's historical credibility.

A good way of exploring what Lucan means to achieve with his use of the Medusa myth is to examine his portrayal of Medusa herself. Representations of Medusa developed increasingly human and sympathetic

11 Fantham 1992: 119.

12 Bexley's chapter in this volume makes several relevant observations on the same passage, although drawing slightly different conclusions.

13 Fantham 1992: 113.

14 Ahl 1967: 103-109; Morford 1967: 128: "as the episode advances Lucan loses sight of his purpose".

15 Bartsch 1997: 29-30.

features as Greek art evolved from the archaic into the classical,[16] a trend which seems to reach a crescendo when Ovid explores (and probably even creates) Medusa's personal tragedy in his version of the story. In Lucan, the sympathising trend is reversed: her dominant characteristic seems to be her power, rather than her pathos. This power is expressed in two ways: first, her gaze is now apparently able to turn things to stone by seeing them, not merely being seen by them;[17] secondly, active and fatal influence is now exerted by all the snakes of Libya, which are born from her blood.[18] It is now dangerous for the Romans even to be passive: the two choices of seeking or avoiding confrontation both result in failure and death. This has clear resonance for both the political content and political context of Book 9. Internally, Cato's own argument that supporting the less bad cause is better than supporting neither (2.295-297) leads now to a disastrous march, and ultimately to his own death at Utica. Externally, as is widely acknowledged, Lucan and the entire senatorial class considered themselves to be caught in a similar double bind: whether choosing to tolerate the tyranny of the principate or to exert Stoic self-control by committing suicide, they were compelled to deny themselves the autonomy they desired.

But although Medusa symbolises the annihilation of the Republican self, there is a sympathetic subtext. Medusa is associated directly with *Natura nocens* (629), and Lucan disposes of the Neptune-Athena aetiology for her monstrosity, in which she was raped by Neptune in a temple of Athena and punished by the goddess with a hideous transformation (Ovid, *met.* 4.793-803). This allows not only closer identification with the feminine Earth,[19] but also the elision of her womanliness and her dangerous characteristics, previously placed in tension or opposition by the idea of transformation. Perseus' victorious act itself is phrased as a rape (*rapta Gorgone*, 9.684). Medusa's snakes are styled, and even combed;

16 See Roscher on Medusa's evolution in art; also e.g. Siebers 1983: 24, Paoletti 1988, Wilk 2000: 31-35 and esp. Mack 2002: 585.

17 Fantham 1992: 107.

18 According to Eldred 2000: 73, the *basiliscus* in particular inherits Medusa's ability "to transform without direct action".

19 The opposition between Cato (and his men) and the Libyan landscape in an epic context is easily located in a tradition of gender discourse: "Roman writers of epic repeatedly feminise the ground of heroic action through the symbolic and literal immersion of specific women in the topography of epic, but the figural immersion of women in the landscape is only a small piece of the epic plot. For once engendered the feminised earth metaphorically gives birth to and fosters the male agents who step to the forefront of these narratives": Keith 2000: 63. The snake, as a symbol of boundary-blurring, is therefore both male and female, according to Bartsch 1997: 32-33, although cf. Gideon Nisbet's BMCR review criticising this remark.

the implication that her powers impose a deadly *cultus* (just as Ovid's *Medusenhaupt* had turned people into works of art) is brought out by the pun in *mundo* (9.648), meaning both "earth" and "beauty regime."[20] Lucan makes the tension between Medusa's attractive and deadly aspects graphic and literal, by creating a relationship between her beautiful face and the frightening snakes surrounding it, yet this relationship remains ambivalent. She rejoices in the snakes (*gaudentis Medusae*, 633), yet twenty lines later they shun her face like all other creatures (653-654). When Perseus looms over their sleeping mistress, those still awake attempt to protect her:

> vigilat pars magna comarum
> defenduntque caput protenti crinibus hydri,
> pars iacet in medios voltus oculisque tenebras[21]
> (9.672-674)

> [...] many of her tresses remain awake
> and veiling serpent hair protects her head;
> some lies right across her face and shades her eyes.

Yet when Pallas uses the snakes to cover her face, she does so in order to protect Perseus (9.681-683). By covering her eyes, the snakes could therefore be trying to protect either Medusa or Perseus – or both.

Looking for evidence of Medusa's personal feelings, we find that she forestalled her victims' chance to feel fear by hastening their fate and did not suffer any of them to die (9.637-640). The lack of malice attributed to Medusa – her only emotion is gladness that her snakes are close about her (their main task being to cover her up), and she wants to turn her victims to stone before they can feel fear – creates an uncomfortable subtext of

20 *Mundo* [...] *obducere terram* suggests two different allusions to Medusa's creation of stone statues: either "drawing earth over the land" or "concealing the earth with ornaments beauty treatments" (cf. *obductus verbis dolor*, V. *Aen.* 10.64). We might even see Cato's stubborn refusal to dress up even for his own wedding in Book 2, and his uncut hair and beard mourning the Republic (2.374-378) which recall the earliest Romans, *hirsuti coloni* (Ov. *am.* 3.10.17), as a gendered assertion of the 'natural' masculine body which is so frequently under assault, both in this poem and in Roman nationalist discourse in general. Caesar is not as *luxuriosus* in Lucan as he is in Suetonius (*circa corporis curam morosior*, *Caes.* 45; *pronum et sumptuosum in libidines*, 49-52). However, in Book 1 the corruptions of Roman men – which enabled Caesar to gain power – include wearing clothes which are risqué even for women (1.164-165), and in Book 10 Caesar himself, adorned with roses and cinnamon oil, covets the Alexandrian extravagance which even Fabricius, Curius or muddy Cincinnatus would envy (10.151-154).

21 The syntax is problematic here; Housman inserts a line afterwards (*offundit clausis et somni duplicat umbras*) to complete the sense.

sympathy for Medusa. In Book 9, she is a victim herself, since Neptune and Athena have been replaced by an unmotivated *Natura nocens*. This places her in an isolation so absolute that we begin to wonder whether even her snakes themselves are companions or merely twenty-four-hour wardens. Under the right kind of inspection, the emerging pathos for Medusa in Greek art and poetry and in Ovid seems to find further continuity in the *Bellum Civile*.[22]

The Libyan snakes are earthborn extensions of Medusa's gaze. Her power is greater in Lucan than ever before, and even she herself is victim to it, as prone as everyone else to the perniciousness of *Natura*. It has become part of the challenge to the integrity of the Roman self, brought to a crisis by the events of the *Bellum Civile*. The grotesque deaths of Cato's men are enactments of the enduring Medusan challenge to both public and private levels of Roman identity.

3. Mythic and Geographic Uncertainties

It will now be helpful to look at Lucan's uses of myth elsewhere in Libya, and beyond. Matthew Leigh has argued that the intellectual space of Libya in ancient literature has two opposing features: arduous desert conditions, and destructive temptations in the form of the snakes and other creatures that live there.[23] This reading works well for the snakes-episode, as we have seen; but Libya features differently elsewhere in the epic. Geographical remoteness is often associated with remoteness of possibility: Lucan's Libya is repeatedly associated with myth and divine machinery and, in particular, with the difficulties of using them.

The story of Lake Triton in Book 9 is a brief but telling example. In Libya, which (in one of Lucan's characteristic rationalising asides) is the hottest part of the world and therefore closest to the *aether*, the sun, and heaven (9.351), Pallas first alighted after birth, and saw her own face reflected in the lake. Lethon, the river of forgetfulness, flows past it from the underworld; and there lies the Garden of the Hesperides with its dragon. But as Lucan points out twice with the same phrase, *ut fama* (9.348, 356), this is legend rather than fact. Feeney has shown that Lucan's abandonment of the *Götterapparat* leaves him in a state of ignorance and

22 Rimell 2006, a study of Ovid's poetics, offers detailed discussions of Medusa as a symbol of power and pathos.

23 "If the featureless and empty terrain of Libya is that of the Stoic pilgrim's progress, the impact of the remarkable serpents lurking in the region incarnates the opposite principle of colour and profusion": Leigh 2000: 103.

aporia concerning the content and function of myth-based poetry,[24] but he is also capable of showing the certainty of scepticism, even in connection with Libya. He interrupts his aside with another aside:

> invidus, annoso qui famam derogat aevo,
> qui vates ad verum vocat. 360
> (9.359-360)
>
> It is a grudging man who taxes time immemorial of its fame,
> Who orders poets to tell the truth.

To align the non-mythological poet with the *spoliatis frondibus* of the previous line provides an aptly ambiguous image: would it have been better if Hercules had left us some golden apples? Hercules is of course the direct link between the Medusan and Antaean regions of the Sahara in Books 4 and 9.

Another Libyan landmark of contested nature and uncertain location is the source of the Nile, and in this case the absence of a reliable account once again expresses the frustrated goals of Lucan's historical narrative. The banqueting Caesar tells Acoreus that if he could be shown the origin of the Nile, Libya's ultimate secret which all tyrants all seek in vain (Sesostris, Cambyses, Alexander, and indeed Nero),[25] he would allow the war and its poem to finish:

> [...] spes sit mihi certa videndi
> Niliacos fontes, bellum civile relinquam.
>
> As long as I can rely on seeing
> The Nile's source, I will abandon the Civil War.
> (10.191-192)

As Acoreus will reply, however, such a conclusion is made impossible by the various designs of *Natura*.[26]

The comparison of Caesar to a Libyan lion at 1.205-212 initiates Lucan's strong political alignment of supernatural beings and other-worldliness: historical epic is linked with Republicanism, mythical epic with dictatorship. Lucan does not control historical discourse with Caesar's irresistible force,[27] but when Caesar himself is involved he seems able to wield the whole arsenal of epic in defiance of the epicist:

---

24 "His failure to represent the gods is testimony to their poetic power, not their weakness. He has not abandoned the gods, they have abandoned him": Feeney 1993: 285.

25 Sesostris, Cambyses, Alexander: Lucan. 10.268-282. Nero: Sen. *nat.* 6.8.3-4.

26 Lucan. 10.237-239, 10.271, 10.295, 10.327-328.

27 By which this simile itself is validated. "Caesar transgresses all conventional codes, social boundaries, linguistic categories; re-deploys around his name all meanings; fixes a new centre from which all discourse is oriented and enforces his signs absolutely": Henderson 1998: 185.

sicut squalentibus arvis
aestiferae Libyes viso leo comminus hoste
subsedit dubius, totam dum colligit iram;
mox, ubi se saevae stimulavit verbere caudae
erexitque iubam et vasto grave murmur hiatu
infremuit, tum torta levis si lancea Mauri
haereat aut latum subeant venabula pectus,
per ferrum tanti securus volneris exit.

just as, on the unkempt fields
of heat-wielding Libya, when the lion has seen his enemy
he crouches suspiciously, until he can gather all his wrath;
soon, when he has goaded himself with lashes of his savage tail,
raised his mane, and rumbled a deep roar from his wide-yawning mouth,
then, if the spear hurled by the nimble Moor
should stick in him or the hunting-spear enter his broad chest,
he goes on over the steel, heedless of so great a wound.

The lash that causes mad rage is the property of supernatural beings associated with war, notably the Furies, and also of Bellona and Mars, to both of whom Caesar is compared at 7.567-570. The lion-simile associates Caesar with Libya as the place of heat, ferocity and madness; it also links both Caesar and Libya with the battles that drive this and other epics through the images of the spear, the hunting-spear, and the enraging lash.[28] Caesar, the *rabies populis stimulusque furorum* (7.557), takes on these mythical attributes through association with the myth-saturated location of Libya.[29] As a region of often shifting, largely featureless landscape, coupled with a 'history' of unsubstantiated conjecture and myth, Libya becomes the definitive conceptual space for Lucan's constructions and deconstructions of epic myth; not only in its subversions of aetiology, prophecy and allegory,[30] but its subversion of *virtus* in the form of Caesar and the Caesareans.

The Medusa-excursus (9.619-699) is a digressive backwater containing treacherous conceits, in which the paradox and litotes begin to warp the meaning of the text, and narrative logic no longer provides the stability a reader would expect from, for example, Virgilian (or even Ovidian) epic. The trouble begins as soon as Cato drinks the *dubium venenum* of the oasis (9.616). Instead of receiving a reassurance that the poison-tainted water had no effect, we are diverted into a new question about the poisonous Libyan air (619), and then given an explicitly false story instead

28 Emphasised by Putnam 1995: 237-239.

29 This passage forms a significant contrast with Pompey/Lucan's failure to make myth work in Lucan. 8.869-872.

30 Namely the Medusa and Tritonis aetiologies, the (unheard) prophecy of Ammon, and the Stoic allegory of Cato's journey.

of the real cause, which no painstaking of ours and Lucan's (*noster*) can discover (9.621-622). This indirect transition into the story involves leaps and turns to wrong-foot the reader. The description of Medusa's powers does the same. Instead of 'all who look on her face die', Lucan says:

> hoc habet infelix, cunctis inpune, Medusa,
> quod spectare licet.
> (9.636-637)
>
> Unlucky Medusa has this, that all may look on unharmed.

The two rhetorical questions which follow

> nam rictus oraque monstri
> quis timuit? quem, qui recto se lumine uidit,
> passa Medusa mori est?
> (9.637-639)
>
> For who has feared the stare and face
> of the monster? Who, that saw her directly,
> was allowed by Medusa to die?

keep things uncertain by challenging the reader to develop his/her own opinion about the monster herself, and the digression in general. The *Natura* which lies idle in Libya (*deside torpet*, 9.436) makes all the throats of Cato's men scaly with dust (*squalebant pulvere fauces*, 9.503) and Medusa's fields unkempt (*squalebant late |...| arva*, 9.626). The textuality of this mythological excursus is equally unkempt, both courting and challenging the engagement of the reader in the same way as its central figure. Even in an epic whose disjointed structure and contradictory verbal fabric is a constant metaphor for its subject-matter,[31] this mythological bridge into the snakes episode is wilfully awkward. Lucan prefaces an incredible (but historically 'true') series of deaths with a supposedly credible (but historically 'false') explanation for the snakes being there in the first place. Both Lucan's treatment of myth and his narrative style reflect the instability of the Libyan environment itself.

Since the Libya of Book 9 is shifting sand, and the Libya of Book 4 is solid rock, we might make a simplistic distinction between the two stories in terms of gender. Medusa is Libya gendered female, her snakes representing hidden, unpredictable, pernicious fertility. Antaeus is Libya gendered male, his lions representing unrestrained aggression and anger. But we can do better than this. In contrast to the Medusa-excursus, several aspects of the myth of Antaeus emphasise integration and coherence,

31 This is one of the insights into scholarship on Lucan contributed by Henderson 1987.

even to the point of symmetry. The story is framed by references to *vetustas* (in couplets that rhyme with one another),[32] an authority which, unlike the *annosum aevum* of 9.359, is not under dispute. It is, in fact, "reliable" (*non vana*, 4.590), and the tale has been "transmitted down the generations" (*cognita per multos* |...| *patres*, 4.592). This contest contains several elements of internal balance and symmetry: Juno and Tellus are maternal figures; the competitors make similar preparations, and in particular, each throws down a lion skin (4.612-613). Antaeus, indeed, is hardly less human than Hercules.[33]

4. Antaeus' Lions

The Antaeus episode contrasts with the Medusa-excursus in many ways. It is a 'neat' story: the narrative is a single direct speech (containing not even a single apostrophe); the competitors are equally matched, each a mixture of humanity and monstrous savagery; the contest is won by Hercules for the good of humankind, the death of the ogre achieving closure like that of Virgil's Cacus; and the events are accepted by Lucan as fact. In another contrast with the Medusa-episode, a five-line coda supplants the Antaeus legend with that of Scipio, who encamped on the spot and thus claimed it in the name of Roman history. But, of course, this claim is not successful. In the desert of Book 9, Cato's freedom-fighters suffer another stage of their journey towards failure; amid the rocks of Book 4, Hercules and Scipio succeeded, but Hercules (as in *Aeneid* 8) does so by turning into the ogre against which he fights. The over-confident Caesarean Curio is about to lose against Libya, a supernatural and savage opponent embodied by various figures, including Antaeus.[34] However, on this occasion, the Caesarean becomes merely a Roman, and therefore not empowered by Libya, but resisted by it.

Animal imagery is appropriate to Libya, as a wild place, but carries a special resonance in the comparison of Lucan's two Libya myths: each of the pair features repeated reference to a dangerous animal, in the first

32 4.590-591 (|...| *vetustas*/|...| *terras*) and 4.654-655 (|...| *vetustas*/|...| *causas*).

33 The word *vir* is used of Antaeus at 9.622, 626, 629 and 644 (and of Hercules at 659); he is a *iuvenis* at 650. It is merely implied (4.610), not actually stated, that he is a *monstrum*. The choreography of the fight makes it clear that he does not have the serpent-tails, multiple arms, or excessive size of his various brothers. He even exhibits *virtus* (*virtus* |...| *terrae spernit opes*, 9.607-608), which may be a satirical reference to the moralising trope of the luxurious despoliation of the earth's resources (see also Evander's instruction to Aeneas, *Aeneid* 8.364: *aude, hospes, contemnere opes*).

34 Grimal 1949: 60: "Antée est le Libyen par excellence; il est *la* Libye".

the lion, in the second the snake. Whereas in Lucan the snake is an often-invisible menace (9.715), and one whose attack is unexpected in its effects, speed and fatality, the lion is more quantifiable as a threat, and even approaches familiarity. Except when Caesar is likened to a sparring lion, they are more prey than predator: among Juba's forces we find

> et solitus vacuis errare mapalibus Afer
> venator ferrique simul fiducia non est 685
> vestibus iratos laxis operire leones.
> (4.684-686)

> the African hunter too, used to wandering among deserted huts,
> and (when he has no faith in his weapon)
> smothering angry lions with his loose clothing.

Hercules famously killed the lion whose skin he wore by strangling it, while Antaeus not only wore the skin of one, but ate them for breakfast (*epulas raptos habuisse leones*, 4.602). The unexpected relationship between man and lion, set up here in Book 4, adds an extra nuance to the ironic phrase which marks the moment when the disorienting landscape of Book 9 turns back into familiar ground under Cato's feet:

> iamque illi magis atque magis durescere pulvis
> coepit et in terram Libye spissata redire
> [...] quanta dedit miseris melioris gaudia terrae
> cum primum saevos contra videre leones!
> (9.942-943, 946-947)

> But now the sand began to get more and more solid to him,
> and Libya, thickening up, began to turn back into land
> [...] how great was the wretched men's happiness at a better terrain
> as soon as they saw savage lions facing them!

The two Libyas of Book 4 and Book 9 represent two different relationships to myth. In the first landscape – a named location, composed of rocks and hollows (4.589, 601-602) and a rampart (659) – a story took place which ended in the decisive triumph of the Stoic icon Hercules, and is unconnected to, but now overshadowed by, the story of a Roman victory against the Carthaginians. These *arva Libyae* even had *coloni* for Antaeus to kill (605-606). The second Libya is very different. For two months Cato and his men travel through the sands, lost among the *squalentibus arvis* (9.939).[35] The victory of Perseus over Medusa – which did not happen – did not prevent her from spawning a host of deadly snakes, against whom (thanks to the Psylli) defence is possible, but not counterattack. The Libyan snakes

35 One soldier asks *qua te parte poli, qua te tellure reliqui, Africa?* 873-874 – "Africa, under what part of the sky, in what land have I emerged from you?"

are on the side of the Caesareans (*pro Caesare pugnant/dipsades*, 9.850-851). Like the Syrtes through which Cato's men have passed, the desert is an unmappable and dangerously unreliable region:

> sic nec clara dies nec nox dabat atra quietem
> suspecta miseris in qua tellure iacebant. 840
> (9.839-840)
>
> Thus neither clear day nor murky night gave rest
> to the wretches, as they lay on suspect ground.

The ambiguity of the myth that seems to explain the snakes infiltrates the texture of the landscape in which it is located. The metaphorical landmarks of the mythic and divine apparatus, which had fixed the terrain of traditional epic (and, to some extent, still do so in the Antaeus story), are lost to us in the swirling sand of Book 9. Meaning becomes something that readers must track down for themselves:

> terga damus ferienda Noto; nunc forsitan ipsa est
> sub pedibus iam Roma meis.
> (9.877-878)
>
> We are offering our backs to be struck by the South Wind;
> perhaps right now, Rome itself is beneath my feet.

5. *Caesar Libycus*

Dubious stories such as the Medusa-excursus, in which the distinction of truth and fiction is blown away (along with all the other distinctions invalidated by civil war), are associated with locations that frustrate or threaten Rome's safety. When Caesar is campaigning against Massilia (3.399-425) we are shown the cold, shadowy grove, uninhabited by rural deities, where *sacra deum* involving human sacrifice are observed (3.402-404). On the authority of *vetustas* (406) (which appears here, as it does both times in Book 4, personified and at the end of its line), we are told that the birds and the weather regard the grove with suspicious reverence, and that

> simulacraque maesta deorum
> arte carent caesisque extant informia truncis.
> ipse situs putrique facit iam robore pallor
> attonitos; non volgatis sacrata figuris 415
> numina sic metuunt: tantum terroribus addit,
> quos timeant, non nosse, deos.
> (3.412-417)

> stern images of the gods,
> lacking art, stand shapeless in cut down tree-trunks.
> Their mustiness itself, and the paleness of their now-rotten wood
> makes people petrified. They do not fear the spirits
> worshipped in ordinary forms this way; they are so much more afraid
> when the gods they fear are unknown.

According to legend (*fama ferebat*, 3.416), supernatural features have been seen here, including mysterious lights (and winding *dracones*, 3.419). Once it has been established that everyone and everything fears this place and its anonymous gods, Caesar is introduced, and has the grove cut down as fuel for his war machine. As Putnam notes, Caesar himself, in terrorising his men into joining his *nefas* (3.437), as elsewhere, becomes superior to (other) divine authorities:

> No harm comes to him from desecrating the numinous grove because Caesar himself is a higher numen and his panoply of anger, savagery, resentment, and fury is more immediately telling than anything Lucan's invisible gods could offer.[36]

Caesar is an agency not of wrathful gods, but of chaos, and his blasphemy must go unavenged:

> servat multos fortuna nocentes
> et tantum miseris irasci numina possunt.
> (3.448-449)
>
> Fortune protects many wrongdoers
> and the gods can only rage at the wretched.

Caesar becomes a god, in the sense that he embodies the destructive power of mythical figures such as Antaeus or Medusa.[37] He is a disruptive, superhuman presence in the world, aligned with Libya and its anti-Roman inhabitants whether mythical or historical: Antaeus, Medusa, snakes, lions, Hannibal. It seems that the only reason Curio is defeated in Libya, rather than taking on its savagery and achieving victory as Hercules did, is that his opponents are Libyans. Curio's forces are therefore not so much Caesarean as simply Roman; the disruptive power of Libya overcomes this Roman army, just as Caesar overcomes Rome, and Libyan myth overcomes historical narrative. Scipio is the only famous Roman to go to Libya and neither be harmed by it, nor harm Rome himself (after Pharsalia, Scipio would go on to become "the biggest general in Libya", *Libyco dux primus in orbe*, 7.222-223). Yet his ghost in the underworld laments that his descendant will die there (6.788-789). Libya makes Scipio himself suffer. This

36 Putnam 1995: 236-237.

37 Cf. Marti 1945: 363, Phillips 1968: 300.

pattern is so consistent that we might even see Pompey's continual reference to Libya, both in his speech to the senators and to the captain of his boat, as foreshadowing the death that awaits him as soon as he draws near it.

Despite Lucan's rejection of the gods as speaking and acting characters in his narrative, there are certain places in the world of the *Bellum Civile* in which myth endures. The Gallic grove is one example, Thessaly another;[38] even Italy becomes one at times, especially at the end of Book 1; but the greatest and most recurrent context for mythic contaminations of the historical narrative is Libya. In these locations, Roman 'control' – both military and emotional – is subverted by myth, madness and the supernatural. Libya is associated with Caesar through simile and metaphor, just as it is associated with Marius.[39] This aligns the two civil-war-inducing *populares* with Libya's home-grown assailants of the Roman Republic (including Hannibal,[40] Juba I, Jugurtha, Cleopatra VII, the snakes, and Ptolemy). Just as the first Triumvirate consisted of Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar, and the narrative is dominated by Pompey, Cato, and Caesar, the world itself is also divided into three: Europe, Asia, and Caesarean Libya.[41]

The poem as we have it begins with Caesar just outside Italy (at the Rubicon, 1.183-185), intending to enter; it ends with him just inside Libya (at Pharos, 10.534-539), intending to leave. The final book repeats and extends the reversal that occurs when Curio enters Libya and loses his Caesarean wildness and vitality. When Caesar enters Libya (i.e. Cleopatra's Alexandria), even his own savage version of *virtus* is undermined and he becomes a self-indulgent adulterer instead of a disciplined general,[42] re-enacting Aeneas' encounter with that other North African queen, Dido.[43]

38 The ruins of Troy, the only place in Asia visited by Caesar, are overgrown by wild vegetation and rotten trees recalling the Gallic grove in Book 3 (I thank Emily Gowers for this observation). Caesar's trampling of the myth-filled ruins of Troy therefore combines the Gallic grove with Thessaly: the destruction of a revered landscape, and the solicitation of the dead regarding the civil wars (9.986-999).

39 Lucan. 2.69, 2.93, 8.269-271. See Ahl 1972: esp. 1007: "Caesar definitely shares a certain *Libycus furor* with Turnus [in the Aeneid] and Marius."

40 The war with Hannibal was *martem Libyae* (1.255).

41 Lucan. 6.816-817, 9.411-412.

42 In lines 10.72-81 Caesar seems to relax his military ambitions slightly: he mingles love with his other concerns, allows his enemy to regroup *in extremis Libyae* [...] *regnis*, and prefers to give Egypt to Cleopatra rather than conquer it for himself. He will shortly find himself outmanoeuvred at Pharos.

43 In Book 9, in a departure from Virgil's account, we are told that Aeneas himself visited the Eastern side of Libya (9.42-44), and liked it (*placuisse*).

In the last moment of our poem, even Caesar himself (despite retaining his wildness in an echo of Book 1's 'Libyan lion' simile at 10.445-446) is on the point of being defeated by Libya's landscape and people. The destructive power of mythical regions and the supernatural creatures that dwell in them is, most of the time, shared by Caesar, who is figured through Libyan affinities as a threat to Rome, as too are Hannibal, Marius and Alexander.[44] Yet ironically, when Caesar himself enters Libyan Egypt, he follows in the footsteps of other Romans debilitated and even destroyed by the savage and mysterious power of the region: Aeneas, Curio, Pompey, and Cato. Perhaps the fact that Caesar meets resistance from this uncontrollable continent shows that he has moved from the outside to the inside: he is no longer a threat to Rome, but a Roman under threat. In the end, Libya is still the home of the new, the outside, and the subversive.

44 Lucan's evil Alexander, though of course originating in Macedonia, passed easily by the Syrtes and Ammon (10.37-38).

The Myth of the Republic: Medusa and Cato in Lucan, *Pharsalia* 9

ERICA BEXLEY

Lucan's *Pharsalia* contains two prominent mythic excursuses: Hercules and Antaeus in Book 4 (581-660), and Perseus and Medusa in Book 9 (619-699). For a long while the former was more familiar and has, as a result, benefited from numerous insightful analyses demonstrating how it functions as a paradigm for the desert montage that follows it.[1] The latter remained relatively untouched until a recent profusion of articles and commentaries began to highlight many of its central themes.[2] All of this discussion has been immensely fruitful. Nonetheless, much remains to be said about how the Medusa excursus directs attention towards specific aspects of Cato's subsequent behaviour. Although more complex than Hercules and Anteaus, Perseus and Medusa perform essentially the same function within Lucan's narrative, establishing a frame of reference against which each proceeding sequence of action may be read. That these inset tales are meant to mirror each other is confirmed by their respective positions in the fourth and ninth book – a balance that would be even more apparent were the epic completed to its probable twelve-book conclusion.[3] Moreover, the two stories share significant motifs. Both are set in Libya; both recount a one-on-one confrontation between a civilizing mythic hero and a monstrous native inhabitant; both are followed by a battle sequence.

1 For interpretations of Hercules and Antaeus, see Ahl 1972 and 1976: 91-103, Grimal 1949, and Saylor 1982. Bruère and Thompson 1970: 167-172 detail the important Virgilian echoes in this episode.

2 For example, Eldred 2000, Malamud 2003, Papaioannou 2005, Raschle 2001, and Saylor 2002. The recent commentary on Book 9 by Wick 2004 also, obviously, treats this episode in depth.

3 Fantham 1992: 97. For discussion of the estimated length of Lucan's unfinished epic, see Vögler 1968: 222-226, and Ahl 1976: 307-325 who refutes the idea proposed by Bruère 1950 and Thompson 1964 that Lucan's work would have ended at Actium. Yet another view is espoused by Brisset 1964: 163 and Masters 1992: 216-259, who argue that the work is complete as we have it. This theory, clever though it is, attributes too much of a contemporary twentieth-century aesthetic to Lucan, assuming a lack of closure that is simply not characteristic of early imperial Latin literature.

They are also neatly antithetical, since the myth of Antaeus is recounted to a Caesarian, the slippery Curio to whom Lucan gives the dubious honour of being the *vendor urbis* (4.824), while Perseus and Medusa pertain to a 'Pompeian', the upright Cato, whom Lucan describes as *pater urbi* (2.388). The evident parallel nature of these two digressions implies that Perseus and Medusa are just as vital for interpreting Cato's battle as Hercules and Antaeus are for understanding Curio's.[4]

As an interpretive paradigm, this mythic excursus brings the major motifs of Cato's ophidian encounter into sharp relief. Ostensibly, the tale explains why Libya has so many deadly serpents that can band together to attack Cato's men. Yet this *aition* is not the sole or even the most important purpose of Lucan's story. The poet focuses upon the image of Medusa's severed head and the powerful effect of her eyes. He subsequently uses these two motifs to illustrate Cato's *virtus*. On the one hand, the decapitated Medusa symbolizes the doomed republican cause and the disintegrating body of traditional Roman government. Faced with such violence and ruin, Cato is helpless. Yet on the other hand, Lucan transforms Medusa's stony gaze into a positive force and stresses that Cato's role as a witness helps his soldiers endure their pain.

Elucidation of these motifs was the original, single purpose of this paper. The result, however, rapidly became twofold, since any analysis of this episode inevitably requires a concluding pronouncement on the effectiveness of Cato's *virtus* and the *libertas* Lucan thereby envisages. This in turn demands some consideration of the unfortunately hazy details of Lucan's life, his political and philosophical stance in particular. Consequently, my focused examination of how the Perseus and Medusa story directs one's subsequent interpretation of Cato and the snakes has also become the basis for a broader discussion of the views that may have influenced and shaped Lucan's poem.

1. Medusa's Head

At first glance, the paradigm presented by Perseus and Medusa appears straightforward: Perseus, a culture hero, arrives in Libya to confront and defeat a native snaky opponent. This inset, as a traditional epic motif, prompts expectations that Cato will somehow fulfill Perseus' role just

4 Admittedly, Lucan writes one other mythic digression at 9.348-367 and also uses it to illustrate Cato's character. On this, see Ahl 1976: 260-262, and Shoaf 1978: 146-150. The connections Lucan draws between Hercules and Cato are certainly significant but their brevity coupled with their lack of proximity to the snake episode suggests that they are a less direct and specific interpretive paradigm than Perseus and Medusa.

as Aeneas makes use of Hercules' *exemplum* in the *Aeneid* (8.185-275).[5] Were this the case, Cato would eventually triumph in his battle with the snakes and thereby achieve a symbolic, moral victory over the destructive forces of Caesarian tyranny and civil violence.[6] This, however, is not what Lucan wrote. Cato never actually fights a serpent hand-to-hand; instead, Cato's soldiers are the hapless victims of Libya's venomous reptiles, and the battle they undertake results in no definite outcome of victory or defeat. As in his treatment of Hercules, Antaeus, Curio and Juba, Lucan here subverts the expectations created by his own digression. Only, in this instance, it is all the more surprising since the *Pharsalia* portrays Cato in far more positive terms than Curio. While the earlier mythic excursus makes a strong point about the unnaturalness of civil war, the misplaced *virtus* it entails, and the Caesarian propensity to misinterpret history,[7] the later one forgoes the opportunity for a contrasting celebration of Cato. In fact, Perseus is hardly the focus of this mythic inset; Medusa far eclipses her antagonist, and the principal pattern of association that emerges is the gorgon, Cato and the republican cause.

Lucan achieves this seemingly improbable link via one of the most prevalent images in his epic: the severed head.[8] That Medusa's decapitation was already an integral part of the myth before it was subjected to Lucan's stylus does not in any way preclude its significant bearing on the narrative. Cut off, dripping gore, held in the hands of a conqueror, the severed head is one of the focal images of Book 9, which culminates in Caesar weeping crocodile tears over the head of his rival, Pompey.[9] In anticipation and echo of this historic beheading, Lucan strews the *Pharsalia*'s narrative with headless *trunci*: the victims of Sulla's purges are defaced and decapitated (2.124; 166-167; 171-173; 190-191); wretched Massiliotes struggle to identify their relatives' headless bodies (3.760-761); Agave and Pentheus make an appearance in Lucan's description of Thessaly (6.357-359); anonymous soldiers at Pharsalos practice pre-despoliation decapitation (7.626-628) and facial mutilation (7.628-630); even Cato envisages

5 This is not to imply that Virgil's inset story of Hercules and Cacus is in any way unproblematic, just that Virgil's narrative does not associate Aeneas with Cacus. Such an inversion is alien to the world of the *Aeneid*, but perfectly characteristic of Lucan.

6 See below, 141-143.

7 Ahl 1976: 91-103. The Caesarian tendency to misread, or be ignorant of history is most prominently displayed in Caesar's tour of Troy near the end of Book 9.

8 Malamud 2003: 32. For a detailed analysis of the role of *caput* in Lucan's epic, see Dinter 2005: 301-304.

9 Fantham 1992: 110 and Malamud 2003: 32.

beheading as one of his possible fates (9.213-214).[10] Given the context, Medusa's head represents the republican army and cause that Cato has inherited.

Lucan's bloodied *capita* also symbolize more than Pompey's death. Taken together with Lucan's other prolific scenes of mutilation, they represent the disintegration of the state, of Rome's power and the republic's – an association made patently obvious by the tasteless pun Lucan inserts into the mouth of Gnaeus Pompey (9.123-125):[11]

> Dic, ubi sit, germane, parens; stat summa caputque
> orbis, an occidimus Romanaque Magnus ad umbras
> abstulit?

Earlier in his epic, Lucan refers to Rome as *caput mundi* (2.136; 655), establishing a parallel between Rome's political control and the body's physical integrity.[12] Similarly, he imagines the Senate as a collection of *membra* (5.36-37). Hence his descriptions of mutilation are more than simple Neronian indulgence in gory detail; they constitute a very literal enactment of the common metaphor that aligns body and state.[13]

So Perseus' decapitation of Medusa, like all others in the *Pharsalia*, is a symbol of the most graphic crime of civil war and of Rome's corresponding political turmoil. Moreover, as Fantham astutely observes, when Lucan imagines Medusa he employs idiomatic terminology reminiscent of conflict: *adversa fronte*.[14] That Lucan uses this and similar phrases repeatedly in his portrayal of the battle of Pharsalos indicates how integral

10 Most 1992: 397.

11 Bartsch 1997: 16 analyzes this excerpt with the remark "the state in civil war becomes a mutilated body parallel to those of its citizens."

12 Dinter 2005: 302.

13 This metaphor appears to have been fairly prevalent in Latin literature, particularly in the late republican and Augustan periods. Cicero puts it into Catiline's mouth in *Mur.* 1.51. Livy 1.55 describes the discovery of a real human head on the Capitol as a favourable portent for Rome's *imperium*. Indeed, Livy seems to have liked the metaphor, referring to Rome as *caput orbis* at 1.16.7 and 21.30.10-11 and placing the idea into Menenius Agrippa's story at 2.32.8-12. Ovid likewise uses the phrase in *am.* 1.15.25-26 and *met.* 15.434-435. In *clem.* 1.3.4-5, Seneca describes the populace's dependence upon a king in terms of the body being ruled by the head.

14 Fantham 1992: 101-102. She also observes that Lucan makes two references to Pallas Athena's aegis in Book 7 (149 and 570), both of which imply that the goddess and her gorgon emblem are fighting on the Pompeian side. Clearly Lucan's link between Medusa and the Pompeian partisans is not isolated to Book 9.

the image is to the poet's vision of civil war.[15] A further verbal marker of civil violence is the phrase *caesa caput Gorgon* (9.679). Here, as on many other occasions throughout the epic, Lucan is punning on Caesar's name, an assertion that is confirmed by the juxtaposition of *caesa* and the severed head that evokes the republic's final death throes. The story of Perseus and Medusa is shot through with motifs of civil strife, and these associations in turn imply that Cato's battle with the snakes ought to be read as yet another warped form of bellum civile.

This is certainly the case. Even though Lucan's snakes all have Greek names and hence are not specifically designated as the soldiers' fellow citizens,[16] Cato's men still perceive this encounter as the equivalent of the battle of Pharsalos. Exhausted and distraught, they exclaim *reddite Thessaliam |...| pro Caesare pugnant/dipsades et peragunt civilia bella cerastae* (9.849; 850-851). Not only do the Libyan serpents conduct *civilia bella*, but they also seem to do it on Caesar's behalf. Of course it is not clear whether *pro* should be read as "instead of" or, more resonantly, "on behalf of", but either way these republican soldiers view the snakes as substitutes for their Caesarian opponents.[17]

Lucan also ensures a close connection between the violence of the myth and the serpentine attack by continuing to emphasize *capita*. The first snake in the catalogue is described as a head – *hic quae prima caput movit de pulvere tabes/aspida somniferam tumida cervice levavit* (9.700-701).[18] That Lucan also refers to its neck doubly enforces the association with civil strife and the unlucky Pompey. Still within the catalogue, the *amphisbaena* is portrayed with a *geminum caput* (9.719). During the attack on Cato's soldiers, the *dipsas* twists back its head to bite – *torta caput retro* (9.738), Sabellus' neck and head liquefy (9.781), and a *iaculus* spears poor Paulus

15 Fantham 1992: 101. This phrase, and variations on it, occur at 7.321; 465; 575; 621. Malamud 2003: 38 also observes that Perseus is described as *aversus* at 9.676.

16 Batinski 1992: 76 asserts that the snakes' Greek names establish them as suitable enemies for Roman soldiers. However, the battle of Massilia in Book 3 is waged primarily against Greeks and Lucan still depicts it as civil war: see Raschle 2001: 251. It is true that Lucan focuses on the snake's names, but his purpose is partly to set up a mock *aristeia* – see Johnson 1987: 52-53 – and partly to explore the etymology of the names via the soldiers' deaths. This latter effect of the episode is noted by Eldred 2000: 66-72, and Martindale 1976: 51.

17 In this same volume, Lowe makes the interesting observation that Lucan often uses Libyan animals in similes for Caesar and his soldiers: "Libyan beasts are anti-republican metaphors (p. 120)."

18 Eldred 2000: 65.

through the temples – *serpens/perque caput Pauli transactaque tempora fugit* (9.823-824).[19]

Such graphic violence further confirms this episode as a portrayal of civil conflict, since the soldiers' deaths replicate the disintegration of the body politic. As observed above, one man's head melts – *colla caputque fluunt* (9.781) – while another's frame is distended to the point of being unrecognizable – *tumidos iam non capit artus/informis globus et confuso pondere truncus* (9.800-801). Here the resonance of *caput* and *capit* may not be accidental, and the *truncus* inevitably recalls Pompey.[20] The final scene (9.828-833) in Lucan's catalogue of ophidian combat expresses this body politic motif in yet another of the poet's vividly physically realized metaphors. Murrus spears a basilisk, but the poison still manages to run up the spear and into his arm. In desperation, Murrus performs self-amputation. Here the *Pharsalia* presents civil war in miniature as Murrus fights and mutilates his own body.[21] Also, the cause of this violent act is the king of snakes, the basilisk who *in vacua regnat* [...] *harena* (9.726), further linking Murrus' mutilation with Caesar's tyrannical ambitions.[22]

There remains one other motif through which Lucan sets the snakes' battle against the larger canvas of civil war, and that is the perversion of nature. In the course of the *Pharsalia*, Caesar's onslaught tears head and body from their natural as well as political unity.[23] Lucan imagines Caesar as a destructive natural force (1.151-157) and the war that he instigates as a perversion that even affects the cosmos. Indeed, nature often colludes with Caesar, as at Thessaly, where the topography mirrors Caesarian violence.[24] Since these associations have become well established by the time the reader reaches Book 9, it is not difficult to interpret the snakes as Caesar's momentary replacements: their venom warps natural form and Libya's landscape, *fertilis in mortes* (9.620) co-operates with them. So, when Aulus cannot find water in the *venas* of the desert (9.755), he resorts to opening his own *venas* (9.760). Libya, which is *non nemorum protecta coma* (9.627) breeds the serpents who were originally Medusa's *coma* (9.632 and 672). The effects of snakebite not only dissolve the body's

19 See Eldred 2000: 65 for a fuller description of these passages.

20 Vergil's famous phrase at *Aen.* 2.557 – *iacet ingens litore truncus* – is recalled to a greater or lesser degree every time Lucan uses the term *truncus*. See also Lucan. 8.698-699.

21 Eldred 2000: 71-72 rather tentatively offers this allegorical reading as one of the ways to interpret this final scene of serpentine combat. It is a suggestion I fully support, having interpreted the scene along exactly the same allegorical lines prior to reading her article.

22 Eldred 2000: 72.

23 Dinter 2005: 306-308 regards Caesar's action as dehumanizing the body.

24 See Masters 1992: 150-178.

unity, but also make it exceed its limits – *humanumque egressa modum* (9.794) – in a manner reminiscent of Caesarian overreach. Lucan may link Cato and the republican army with the head of Medusa, but Caesar is undoubtedly embodied in her noxious offspring.

Clearly, Lucan's Perseus and Medusa excursus supports several fundamental and interlinked allegorical interpretations. Both the snakes and Perseus' act of severing Medusa's head symbolize a particularly Caesarian kind of violence and are therefore intimately connected to the civil strife portrayed in the rest of Lucan's epic. The specific parallels between Medusa and Cato confirm Cato's inheritance of the cause for which Pompey ostensibly fought while at the same time underscoring the republican partisans' inevitable defeat. The gods may help Perseus, but the doomed cause of republican Rome has Cato as its only *numen* (1.128). Here Lucan is not concerned with Cato's decision to participate in *civilia bella* – a question he has already considered in Book 2 (286-323) – but with the effectiveness of this participation.[25] Cato's allegorical confrontation with Libya's snakes implies that he is powerless to prevent Rome's body politic from disintegrating. Indeed, his own impotence and the vanity of his venture is something Cato himself acknowledges on more than one occasion.[26] In this respect, his activity is futile: he cannot stop the civil war that is played out in front of him, nor can he revive the republican *libertas* that, he admits, died before he even became involved. Like Medusa's fate, Cato's failure is already a given, cemented into historical and textual record despite Lucan's overwhelming desire to alter it.

Of course, the difficulty inherent in any allegorical interpretation is the sheer range of possible meanings. It is in order to defend my particular reading and locate it in relation to recent scholarship that I append this brief coda to my initial discussion. In keeping with the (still) dominant rubric of post-structuralism, several recent articles on this episode interpret either the mythic excursus or the snakes as being essentially

25 Bonner 1966: 284 observes that the speeches of Cato and Brutus in Book 2 are paired like rhetorical exercises typical of the declamation schools during and just prior to the Neronian era. Clearly, the rapidly developing idea of Cato as a largely Stoic moral *exemplar* sat uneasily beside the unavoidable facts of his participation in civil war.

26 2.301-303: *non ante revellar,*/exanimem *quam te complectar, Roma; tumque*/nomen, *libertas, et* inanem *prosequar* umbram. 2.315-316: *me solum invadite ferro*/*me* frustra *leges et* inania *iura tuentem.* 9.204-206: *olim vera fides Sulla Marioque receptis*/*libertatis* obit*: Pompeio rebus adempto*/nunc et ficta perit. Cato persistently regards the death of the republic and of *libertas* as something that has already happened, perhaps through the benefit of Lucan's twenty-twenty hindsight. This idea also surfaces in Seneca *epist.* 14.13.

metapoetic.[27] Lucan's introductory disclaimer – *non cura laborque/noster .scire valet, nisi quod volgata per orbem/fabula pro vera decepit .saecula causa* (9.621-623) – combined with the myth's overt Ovidian echoes,[28] has led Malamud and Papaioannou to assert that the episode is an allegory for the process of writing poetry.[29] But this misapplies Ovidian themes to Lucan's text: Lucan's metapoetic moments generally occur in relation to a *vates* and not in the context of metamorphosis.[30] Besides, the disclaimer he uses is a reasonably common *topos* of didactic literature.[31] I am in agreement with the aforementioned interpretations to the extent that I have focused my argument upon the patterns of imagery appearing in this passage that are commensurate with those found elsewhere in the epic – heads, mutilation, perversion of nature, and (as remains to be seen) the gaze. Where I differ, however, is in this popular invocation of a closed referential system, namely that poetry is, in the final assessment, about poetry. The purpose of the Perseus and Medusa and snake allegories is to illustrate the character of Lucan's Cato, not just as a persona in Lucan's epic, but also as a historical person, and a political and philosophical ideal. Hence their meaning reaches beyond the confines of the poem, although detailed discussion of this must perforce be postponed until later in my argument.

---

27 Eldred 2000 interprets the snakes as predominantly metapoetic, even declaring (63): "Lucan's epic [...] is itself about poetry." Malamud 2003: 32 asserts that the gorgon's head "is an emblem not just of civil war, but of Lucan's own artistic production, *Civil War*." Papaioannou 2005: 228-234 is influenced by Malamud's argument and suggests that the Medusa episode is designed to draw attention to Lucan's incorporation and adaptation of Ovid's text.

28 Fantham 1992: 104-106 examines Lucan's debt to Ovid in this passage. Malamud 2003 and Papaioannou 2005 base much of their respective analyses on this textual relationship. The connection between Ovid and Lucan also points to the latter's use of Hellenistic literature. Hellenistic influence is almost palpable in the Libyan excursus, especially in the idea that Medusa's blood was the *aition* of snakes (9.696-700, compare *met.* 4.617-620), which derives from A.R. 4.1513-1517. For further details of Lucan's use of Hellenistic literary motifs, see Landolfi 2007, Leigh 2000, and Shoaf 1978: 143-148.

29 Malamud 2003: 32, 40-41 and Papaioannou 2005: 231-234.

30 For a comprehensive study of the *vates* and his or her role in Lucan's epic, see O'Higgins 1988.

31 Wick 2004: 247 analyses other occurrences of this sentiment in Latin literature. Raschle 2001: 180 remarks that the disclaimer may also be used to justify Lucan's transition from historical to mythological material: "Schließlich muss ein am Realismus orientierter Dichter seinem Publikum verständlich machen, warum er vom eingeschlagenen Pfad abweicht und plötzlich seinem Werk mythologische Stoffe hinzufügt."

2. Cato's Eyes

The second and equally important way in which Lucan aligns Cato with Medusa is through the gorgon's gaze. In a recent article, Saylor remarks that looking is key to both the Perseus and Medusa excursus and Cato's battle with the snakes.[32] Lucan's repeated use of the verb *spectare* in these two episodes has encouraged some scholars to interpret them as a warped form of amphitheatrical entertainment.[33] Yet the verb need not necessarily evoke the arena. A more pertinent explanation, and one that more fully clarifies Cato's behaviour is Seneca's idea of the Stoic witness, the self-reflexive spectator who aims at becoming impervious to suffering. Consequently, Lucan aligns Cato's gaze with Medusa's by granting both a hardening effect, although in Medusa's case it is literal and in Cato's more emotional. As with the severed head, Lucan associates this other fundamental aspect of Medusa with the republican cause: the hapless Pompey stoically composes his own death while Caesar embodies a mutability that is directly opposed to the gorgon's defining characteristic.

In order to explore the meaning and effects of Cato's gaze, it is necessary to address the influential view propounded by Leigh in his 1997 monograph, *Spectacle and Engagement*. Leigh notes that Lucan refers to both Curio's defeat and Cato's odd ophidian battle as *spectacula* (4.784; 9.805).[34] He regards the latter episode as having two kinds of spectatorship, operating on different but interrelated levels: Cato watches his men "with horror and sympathy" while Lucan, in collusion with the snakes he apostrophizes, creates amphitheatrical entertainment resembling a *venatio*.[35] The readers, as spectators, are presented with "an amphitheatre unburdened with Stoic elevation, as just a source of spectacle, a theatre of blood."[36] Moreover, Cato's failure to help his men in any practical way has led Leigh to conclude that the desert march is "an allegory for the impotence of philosophy."[37] A significant result of Leigh's theory about Lucan's aesthetics is that Cato's creed and behaviour are belittled. However, just because Lucan revels in the horror created by the snakes, it does

32 Saylor 2002: 459 provides a comprehensive list of Lucan's references to eyes and looking in this section of Book 9.

33 Leigh 1997: 265-282 is the major proponent of this view. Raschle 2001: 252-253 admits that he largely follows Leigh in his allegorical interpretation of the snakes.

34 Leigh 1997: 250, 279, 290.

35 Leigh 1997: 273-282.

36 Leigh 1997: 279.

37 Leigh 1997: 273.

not follow that their violence is more integral to Lucan's meaning than Cato's steadfast survival.

While I certainly agree with Leigh that Lucan's Libyan scenes employ imagery of the games – indeed the element of spectacle is a crucial part of all Lucan's civil war descriptions – I do not find his interpretation of Cato convincing. In the first place, Cato does not watch his men "with horror and sympathy" so much as with an extreme form of detachment (9.881-889):

> cogit tantos tolerare labores
> summa ducis virtus, qui nuda fusus harena
> excubat atque omni fortunam provocat hora.
> omnibus unus adest fatis; quocumque vocatus
> advolat atque ingens meritum maiusque salute
> contulit, in letum vires; puduitque gementem
> illo teste mori. quod ius habuisset in ipsum
> ulla lues? casus alieno in pectore vincit
> spectatorque docet magnos nil posse dolores.

Cato is present at every man's death, but the only support he provides is the strength for them to die, and this comes through his role as *spectator*.[38] He does not treat these deaths as a form of entertainment[39] nor does Lucan create a separate narrative level for his readers to regard them as such. Admittedly, Cato's behaviour is odd even for one of Lucan's heroes, a characteristic commonly indicating that Lucan is straining to make a point at the price of verisimilitude, or that he is borrowing material from elsewhere. In this particular instance, Cato's role as both *spectator* and *testis* bears remarkable resemblance to the portraits of the witness that appear in Seneca's *Epistulae*.[40] Notably, Seneca regularly uses the verb *spectare* in these situations. In *epist.* 11.8, he declares:

> Aliquis vir bonus nobis diligendus est ac semper ante oculos habendus, ut sic tamquam illo spectante vivamus et omnia illo vidente faciamus.

He picks up the idea again in *epist.* 25.5 – *"Sic fac," inquit "omnia, tamquam spectet Epicurus"* – and 85.29, where the brave Stoic *invictus ex*

38 Narducci 2001: 182-184 asserts that Lucan also characterizes Cato's behaviour as that of a good and respected general, who tends to all of his men. This is not an unreasonable theory. I do not, however, agree with Narducci's suggestion (183) that Lucan drew upon Caesar's self-promoted *exemplum* in order to praise Cato. Lucan's Cato is completely antithetical to his Caesar and it seems improbable that Lucan would create such an allusion.

39 Leigh 1997: 276 admits this.

40 Narducci 2001: 184-185 likewise draws connections between the behaviour of Lucan's Cato and the role of the witness in Senecan philosophy.

alto dolores suos spectat. This kind of spectator, not the audience member at the games, is the model for Lucan's Cato.

Such evidence leads to a further refutation of Leigh's argument – Cato's battle with the snakes is not entirely free from "Stoic elevation." In fact, a scene Seneca illustrates in *epist.* 78.21 is not only key to Lucan's portrayal of Cato at 9.881-889 but also to Seneca's philosophy:

> Habes, quod agas: bene luctare cum morbo. Si nihil te coegerit, si nihil exoraverit, insigne prodis exemplum. O quam magna erat gloriae materia, si spectaremur aegri! Ipse te specta, ipse te lauda.

This passage, more than any other in the *Epistulae*, explains the behaviour of Lucan's Cato as distinctly Stoic.[41] As is widely recognized, a large part of Seneca's Stoic doctrine concentrates on freeing the individual from fear and its attendant constraints, and so cultivating a variety of personal, self-reliant *libertas.*[42] In this regard, Seneca is often especially concerned with freedom from the fear of bodily suffering.[43] Cato's men are ashamed to die noisily – *puduitque gementem/illo teste mori* (9.886-887). The concept inherent in Lucan's depiction is that they must distance themselves from their own suffering. No matter how ineffectual it may seem given the situation, it is the quality of Cato's endurance and rationalized response that is meant to help his soldiers as they undergo the effects of fatal poison. Earlier in Book 9, Cato has associated his role as *testis* with the soldiers' necessary *patientia* (390-392): *hi mihi sint comites |...|/qui me teste pati vel quae tristissima pulchrum/Romanumque putant.* Essentially, Lucan's Cato allegorizes a Senecan Stoic response to pain.[44] Indeed, it is as if Lucan had lifted Cato from the pages of Seneca and made his role as imagined spectator quite literal.[45]

In keeping with Cato's physical enactment of Seneca's idea, this Senecan brand of emotional detachment even succeeds in saving a life in

41 I have called the Senecan doctrine 'Stoic' for the purposes of simplification in such a short paper, but it is true that Seneca compiled his philosophical views from a variety of authors and this is equally so with Lucan. Treating Lucan's work as an epic of doctrinaire Stoicism is thus misguided, as Lucan appears to have been far more influenced by his uncle's version than any other. For a contrasting view, see Martindale 1984: 72-73.

42 See Gowing 2005: 78-81. Bartsch 2006: 183-208 provides a very informative study of the Senecan concept of freedom and ethical behaviour, and the ways in which the philosopher develops these via the imagined presence of a witness.

43 Bartsch 2006: 194.

44 Narducci 2001: 185.

45 Making physical what is in other works either metaphorical or allegorical is, I feel, a particular quality of Lucan's writing style. Seneca specifically refers to Cato as an ideal witness at *epist.* 11.10; 25.6; 104.21-22.

Pharsalia 9. When Murrus is poisoned by a basilisk, he quickly amputates his own arm in order to continue living (9.830-833):

> quam protinus ille retecto 830
> ense ferit totoque semel demittit ab armo,
> exemplarque sui spectans miserabile leti
> stat tutus pereunte manu.

Via the terms *exemplar* and *spectans*, Lucan replicates the situation described in *epist.* 78 whilst adding his own typically gory epic touch. Murrus has managed to save his own life by means of a very literal, highly graphic form of detachment. That this resistance to pain and death is also a mental state is made clear by the fact that Murrus is able to watch his hand disintegrate as if it were his whole self – *exemplarque sui spectans miserabile leti* (9.832).[46] He resembles the sage described in *epist.* 85.29 who, unconquered, gazes down upon his sufferings. In the midst of all the carnage, Murrus represents a vindication of Cato's impassive stare.

If Cato's ethical gaze is demonstrably Senecan in origin, what, one may well ask, is the role of Medusa in all of this? Her gaze evidently constitutes an important parallel to Cato's. Typically, Medusa's look has a hardening effect. Taking his cue from Ovid, Lucan stresses, in semi-comic detail, the disastrous fate of whatever meets Medusa's eyes – petrified birds even fall from the heavens whenever she looks up into the sky (9.649).[47] At 9.640-641, Lucan's penchant for physical detail portrays the corporeal effect of Medusa's gaze: *anima periere retenta/membra, nec emissae riguere sub ossibus umbrae.* In less literal terms, this is also the intended result of Cato's fixed look. Cato is, as Seneca says, *rigidus* (*epist.* 11.10) and the adjective Lucan most commonly associates with him in Book 9 is *durus.*[48] Like Medusa's, his look should have a hardening effect; unlike Medusa's, it is meant to be salvific rather than mortifying.

Lucan also relies heavily upon the verb *spectare* in his description of Medusa. With characteristic hyperbole and dark irony, he declares that the snaky hair is the only part of Medusa one may look upon and still live (9.636-637): *hoc habet infelix, cunctis impune, Medusa/quod spectare*

46 Leigh 1997: 280-281, reads this depiction against Seneca's portrayal of Mucius Scaevola (*epist.* 24.5), which is a valuable approach, but wrongfully concludes that Lucan's imagery of the amphitheatre induces readers to treat Murrus as spectacle: "the reaction of the safe spectator Murrus offers a surrogate for such behaviour in a way that Mucius never could." Certainly Murrus is safe because he has managed to become a spectator, but a spectator of a very different kind from the one Leigh envisages – not an audience member, but a successful practitioner of Senecan Stoic detachment.

47 See above, n. 28 for discussion of the Ovidian intertext.

48 Thomas 1982: 114-116 notes and analyzes these instances of *durus* in Book 9.

licet. Of course, Lucan's observation skirts the nasty fact that this is not the case with her offspring. *Spectare* further appears in the account of Perseus' deed: Athena gives the hero a shield *in quo sarificam iussit spectare Medusam* (9.670), and is not able to look – *nec Pallas spectare potest* (9.681) – when the gorgon dies. Interestingly, all of these occurrences refer to Medusa as the indirect, reflected or avoided object of somebody's gaze. Lucan's narrative never allows its readers to look directly at the gorgon, nor the gorgon to exercise the power of her eyes. While Cato is a practising subject of this hardening gaze, Medusa, to whom the quality is innate, is only ever an object. On a narrative level, Lucan's trick cleverly keeps his audience safe from Medusa. Yet this play of subject and object could also have a further meaning, one that relates once more to the Senecan Stoic witness. Evidently, imagining a witness to one's deeds requires a certain degree of self-objectification. The paradox that the subject must become at least partially objectified in order to retain its subjectivity is played out in Murrus' harsh action against himself. Hence I tentatively advance the hypothesis that Lucan's Cato and Medusa represent the two contrasting elements of Seneca's idea.

Like Murrus, the dying Pompey perceives himself as both subject and object (8.621): *seque probat moriens*. He distances himself from the physical and emotional pain of his own death (8.615-617; 619-620) and comforts himself that eternity is also his witness – *aevumque sequens speculatur ab omni/orbe ratem Phariamque fidem* (8.623-624). Despite being Lucan's most emotional character, Pompey here attempts to achieve a Senecan form of *libertas*.[49] That this performance is given by the principal defender of moribund republican *libertas* indicates that this older form of political freedom is now no longer achievable. Senecan Stoic *libertas*, the careful maintenance of personal freedom in the face of tyranny, is the best Pompey can hope for.

Medusa's power associates the republican cause with a certain rigidity. Caesar, in contrast, is the essence of mutability, an idea clearly illustrated when Lucan links him to Medusa's serpentine progeny. Far from freezing each man's *anima* underneath his bones, the serpent's bite peels back his skin and opens his guts: *nam plagae proxima circum/fugit rupta cutis*

49 Malamud 2003: 33-37 charts the changes that are wrought on Pompey's head from the moment of his death onward. Given that Pompey is unsuccessful in literally preserving his features, Malamud concludes (33) "Stoic death is overlaid upon the text's digressive, allusive insistence that the Stoic model is insufficient." Yet the whole point of Senecan detachment is that what happens to the body is, essentially, irrelevant. Pompey the man manages not to become enslaved by the pain inflicted by a tyrant, and this is the important point. The changes his head undergoes after this in no way negate his overtly pro-Senecan performance.

pallentiaque ossa retexit;/iamque sinu laxo nudum sine corpore volnus (9.767-769). Cato's men disintegrate (and in one case, inflate) to the point where they are no longer even a recognizable collection of body parts.[50] When Lucan observes *quidquid homo est, aperit pestis natura profana* (9.779), it is clear that the *homo*, as a singular identity in a single, cohesive body, is no longer.[51] Caesar aims to destroy the man, and the state, by destroying its body; Cato, and the Senecan ideals to which he adheres, aim to save some essential humanity by disregarding bodily pain.

Of course, giving his men *vires* via a display of his *virtus* when they are barely *viri* any more understandably makes Cato's morality seem a little fatuous to a modern audience. As a result, some modern critics baulk at what looks like the sheer impotence of Cato's philosophy and assume Lucan must be mocking it.[52] The occasional difficulty inherent in taking Cato seriously lies in the paradoxical nature of Lucan's project. On the one hand, he is presenting a physical enactment of Seneca's idea, so if Cato fails to save his soldiers we want to assume the idea is failing. On the other hand, the idea is about self-restraint, so Cato can only promote it in a passive way.

Nonetheless, Lucan does manage to confirm the positive power of Cato's creed. To discover this confirmation, it is crucial to read the episode in sequence. In the beginning, Cato cannot save Aulus, the victim of a *dipsas* who eventually opens his own veins in an attempt to cure his desperate thirst (9.759-760): *ferroque aperire tumentes/sustinuit venas atque os implere cruore.* The passage conjures images of Stoic suicide, yet this is not, as Morford suggests, a valiant Stoic death. Morford asserts: "he [Aulus] would have failed in his agony had Cato not been present: thanks to him Aulus died master of his fate."[53] But Lucan underscores the shocking perverted nature of the deed by having Cato scurry quickly from the scene (9.761-762): *iussit signa rapi propere Cato: discere nulli/permissum est hoc posse sitim.* For Aulus, the force of thirst triumphs over any form

50 The function and effect of such graphic violence in Lucan's epic is comprehensively and insightfully explored by Bartsch 1997: 10-47. Adopting Kristeva's notion of the abject, Bartsch asserts that in Lucan human identity relies almost solely upon bodily integrity. The confusion between subject and object even carries over into Lucan's syntax, and Bartsch regards this as a powerful expression of civil war, which necessarily violates the boundaries of enemy and ally. For a broader but equally convincing critique of violence in Neronian poetry, see Most 1992.

51 Bartsch 1997: 21.

52 See Leigh 1997: 267-273, and Johnson 1987: 35-66 who reads Cato's virtue as quite simply delusional and argues that, in Lucan's universe, Cato is no better than Caesar.

53 Morford 1967: 128.

of self-restraint or self-reliance, and Cato is powerless to stop it.[54] Yet, when Murrus faces the final ophidian opponent roughly one hundred lines later, his emotional and physical detachment grants him survival. As opening and closing scenes, they frame the ideal of freedom from suffering by presenting one failed and one successful *exemplum*, both in reminiscently Stoic terms.

3. Libertas or Death?

Clearly Lucan's Perseus and Medusa allegory is not a straightforward celebration of one man's triumph over a serpentine opponent. Lucan associates Cato far more with Medusa than he does with Perseus and, as in the case of Hercules and Antaeus, thereby subverts his paradigm. But unlike the pattern of Hercules, Antaeus, Juba and Curio, Lucan's later allegory does not aim solely to cast the historical protagonist in a bad light. Cato is a far more complex character than Curio, and the story of Perseus and Medusa more ambiguous than its counterpart in Book 4. To start with, Perseus does not possess the same Roman military associations as Hercules, a point that detracts from the possibility of his being a civilizing force.[55] The result of his mission is also rather ambivalent, as Medusa's decapitation enables a race of deadly serpents to come into being. Finally, by cutting off her head, Perseus is acting in a way that, in the context of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, embodies the Caesarian conduct of civil war.[56] Medusa is likewise ambiguous. She may be a hideous native Libyan monster, but her face, Lucan avers, also helps the gods to succeed in battle against the giants (9.655-658). Her steely gaze concludes a war that myth records as an assault against the established order of heaven. Unlike Erichtho, who defies and perverts the Olympian powers (6.461-465; 523-525), Lucan's Medusa is a principle of order in Book 7, where she – or, at least, the most important part of her – fights on the Pompeian side.[57]

By linking Cato with Medusa, Lucan illustrates the two principal facets of this troubling hero. On the one hand, he is part of the doomed

54 As Leigh 1997: 269 observes, "Morford is surely correct to see Aulus' opening of his own veins as an imitation of the classic mode of Stoic suicide. It is less clear that it is true to orthodox Stoicism to open one's veins in order to satisfy a raging thirst."

55 One of the many resonances of the Hercules and Antaeus episode is that it represents the conflict between native barbarian and civilized Roman. See Ahl 1976: 96, 98 and Saylor 1982: 170-174. This theme is also present in the Perseus Medusa excursus, but unfortunately I have had neither the time nor the space to explore it here.

56 Malamud 2003: 39.

57 See above n. 14.

republican cause. It is not just that his active involvement in civil war will ultimately be unsuccessful, but that he is also powerless to stop a destructive force that is specifically Caesarian. Medusa's decapitation and the graphic physical disintegration of Cato's soldiers represent the Caesarian impulse to destroy the political body of the republic. Cato struggles against this force that is innately inimical to *libertas* – *par quod semper habemus/libertas et Caesar* (7.695-696) – but ends up its victim rather than its vanquisher. On the other hand, while civil war viciously continues to unfurl before Cato, Lucan attributes a particular kind of power to his hardnosed hero. Cato's gaze confers bravery that is almost as potent as a glance from Medusa. In this manner Lucan illustrates the self-reliant *virtus* and ultimately selfish *libertas* advocated by his uncle Seneca.[58]

The paradox is that Lucan's Cato 'fights' while at the same time seeming to favour a kind of passivity. He knows he cannot save the moribund political system of which he is an integral part, and so advocates the personal freedom of the individual – a freedom he will eventually exercise through suicide.[59] Yet such a view of Cato seems problematic for many prominent critics of Lucan. Both Johnson and Leigh feel that Cato's detachment combined with Lucan's aesthetics – his vicious style, graphic violence, black humour – indicate that the author is undermining the sage and his Stoicism.[60] Sklenář, in contrast, affirms Cato's Stoic ethics, but asserts that they fail to work in Lucan's non-Stoic universe.[61] In each case, critics are trying to resolve the undeniable disharmonies in Lucan's work and his portrait of Cato in particular. Yet they do so by turning Lucan into a kind of postmodern cynic or nihilist.[62] Rudich succinctly encapsulates this critical tendency:

> in the eyes of a post-modernist, any discourse necessarily subverts itself which makes an inquiry into its author's attitudes inconsequential. By disregarding the specifics of the Roman imperial audience as well as the operation of the period's rhetoricized mentality, this kind of scholarship primarily reflects the sensibilities of the reader who is construed not as Lucan's, but as our own contemporary.[63]

58 Shoaf 1978: 150 aptly calls this the "paradox of selfish selflessness."

59 Lintott 1971: 503 expands this idea to embrace the entire project of Lucan's epic: "the moral for the poem was not a political programme (for which Republican history was no longer relevant), but a prescription for the individual."

60 Johnson 1987: 35-66 and Leigh 1997: 265-282.

61 Sklenář 1999 and 2003: 60 posits a "systematic opposition between Cato's ideals and his environment."

62 As Narducci 2001: 172 remarks, this manner of interpreting Cato is largely, if in some cases indirectly, influenced by quasi deconstructionist approaches. Even the author of this paper has proposed a theory along these lines for a forthcoming article – a theory she hereby renounces.

62 Rudich 1997: 108.

The portrait of Lucan as cynically detached is simply not convincing. If nothing else, his narrative voice could certainly never be accused of neutrality.[64] Hence a more fruitful approach may be simply to accept the disharmonies and attempt to trace their varied geneseis.

In the case of Lucan's Cato, several significant and potentially contradictory influences may be hypothesized. As I have already observed, there is notable overlap between Cato's behaviour and that recommended by Lucan's uncle, Seneca. In turn, this politically safe image of Cato as a Stoic wise man is at least partially composed of accretions from the declamatory schools.[65] So far, the portrait is unified. However, Seneca's and the declaimers' Cato is largely dissociated from the complexities of his actual historical context and thus becomes a neatly one-dimensional figure. When Lucan reanimates Cato, he faces the contradictions stemming from Cato's participation in the civil war.[66] Lucan must deal with the historical material that Seneca's sanitized Cato barely addresses. Hence a kind of *contaminatio* takes place between the obviously influential Senecan version of Cato as Stoic *exemplar* and the historical Cato's behaviour. For the Cato of the late republic did not advocate the resignation of an early imperial Stoic.[67] Likewise, the *libertas* he chased was not the same as Lucan's and Seneca's: "Cato's relevance in Neronian Rome |...| lies not in his political views, but rather in the manner in which he conducted himself in trying circumstances."[68] There is more than one definition of *libertas* at work here, and both of them are found in the confusing portrait of Lucan's Cato.[69]

An equally crucial factor in Lucan's depiction of Cato is the poet's own life. As Lucan's critics have often observed with some perplexity, the Pisonian conspiracy for which Lucan became *paene signifer* (Suet. *vita Lucani*) did not intend the restoration of the republic; it was going to replace one Caesar with another.[70] Any argument that the *Pharsalia*

64 D'Alessandro Behr 2007: 7.

65 See Bonner 1966: 284-286 for some details on the deliberations typically put into Cato's mouth for the sake of rhetorical exercise.

66 See above n. 25.

67 George 1991: 239 remarks that as a man, Cato provided both good and bad *exempla*, and that he came to be admired for his *constantia* much more than for his republicanism.

68 Gowing 2005: 79.

69 George 1991: 238 observes that definitions of *libertas*, *dignitas*, and *auctoritas* (to name only a few) changed significantly once the principate was instituted.

70 Griffin 1984: 159 believes that the conflict between Lucan and Nero was purely literary and does not view the *Pharsalia* as a work of opposition in any way. "We shall have to accept that Lucan's political views were seriously inconsistent, for the poem cannot be a manifesto for the conspirator. Love of

supports Cato and denounces Caesarism obviously has to address this glaring detail. So does any argument that Lucan was a nihilist. The most viable solution to this problem is that Senecan philosophy did not view kingship and *libertas* as incompatible: it simply made a sharp distinction between a tyrant and a good ruler.[71] Hence Lucan's epic denounces both Caesar and Alexander as tyrants and has Cato admitting to the death of the republic even when he is involved in a bitter fight for its survival.[72] Yet there is one more snag: the *libertas* Seneca depicts is generally a form of non-involvement whereas Lucan was, in literature and in life, involved up to his eyeballs. Without more detailed evidence, this contradiction can never fully be resolved, but it is clearly yet another integral part of Lucan's view of Cato, whose resistance the poet praises in no uncertain terms.

One final question remains and that is the issue of Cato's *virtus*, the moral quality that enables him to convey strength to his soldiers. Like *libertas, virtus* has various shades of meaning in Lucan's epic and Cato's brand must therefore be carefully delineated. Certainly, the *Pharsalia*'s discordant universe entirely overturns the concept of martial *virtus*, upon which more traditional epic was built.[73] The battle between Cato and the

---

the Republic was not to be served by replacing Nero with another stagestruck aristocrat, and indeed, the conspirators, according to Tacitus, did not invite a consul of the year to join them, because he might urge the restoration of the Republic." By not allowing for this primarily Senecan Stoic notion of *libertas* being compatible with absolute rule, Griffin fails to perceive the possible nuances in Lucan's actions. Also, the passage in Tacitus to which she refers (*ann.* 15.52.3) is not nearly so clear-cut as her argument implies. Piso wished to prevent Marcus Julius Vestinus Atticus from joining the conspiracy *ne ad libertatem oreretur, vel delecto imperatore alio sui muneris rem publicam faceret.* Here Tacitus is using *res publica* in the more general sense of "state" rather than the specific form of government that existed prior to the principate. At the absolute opposite end of the scale from Griffin is Martindale 1984, who argues that Lucan was not aiming for *senatoria libertas* but full restoration of the republic. Yet this view also seems implausible given that Lucan's vicious attacks against Caesar in the *Pharsalia* need not apply to Caesarism *per se*. Martindale 1984: 67 fails to make this careful distinction.

71 See Wirzubski 1950: 143-147 for a concise description of the relationship between Stoicism and *libertas* during the early principate. For the question of *quid interest inter tyrannum et regem*, see Sen. *clem.* 1.2.4.

72 George 1991: 257 concludes, like Martindale 1984, that Lucan rejects the prevalent Stoic theory of a just king and uses the poet's portrayal of Alexander as evidence. Yet, as George himself earlier observes (241), the Roman Stoic writers tended to depict Alexander as an arrogant over-reacher rather than the ideal ruler imagined by some of their Greek counterparts. The major snag with any argument that Lucan aimed at restoring the republic is that it removes the young poet too much from his contemporary milieu.

73 Johnson 1987: 53, 57. Lucan foregrounds this idea early in Book 1 (667-668): *scelerique nefando/nomen erit virtus.*

snakes certainly represents some of the perversions inherent in civil war and civil war narratives. However, Cato's *virtus* should not be judged solely as martial prowess. Although Lucan has Cato admit that he will take part in civil war and that this will inevitably make him *nocens* (2.288), the poet is also careful never to depict him actively engaging in combat. In the snake scene, Cato's *virtus* is not meant to be practical or military, even though Lucan plays upon this meaning by exploring *virtus* in the context of serpentine battles. As is the case with *libertas*, there is some disjuncture between the ideals Lucan attributes to Cato and his historical actions. This does not mean that Lucan does not take Cato's *virtus* seriously, merely that the panoply of history will not fit Stoic theory.

The myth of Perseus and Medusa offers a portrait of Cato as a hero of the doomed republic and a Stoic *exemplar*. Although its parallels are not always pristine, or even straightforward, it provides a framework for interpreting the equally allegorical scene of Cato's battle with the snakes and reveals that his triumph is not so much physical as spiritual. Lucan takes Cato seriously but still does not let him win in any real sense. Yet this is characteristic of Lucan's contradictory vision of Cato – a vision that can only be understood when the text is placed in context. While it is currently out of fashion to make any reference to the author's life, I feel that whatever sketchy evidence we have for Lucan's political and philosophical allegiances provides fundamental background to Lucan's Cato. This character's stubborn defiance of tyrannical power is presented as an admirable trait. It is also, unfortunately, a foregone conclusion from Lucan's vantage point. The detached *sapientia* advocated by Seneca bleeds into Lucan's work as the only option remaining for the man who wishes to be free. Lucan's Cato is simultaneously selfish and selfless; impotent yet powerful. In some respects he is a battleground for Lucan's own political views, and the key to understanding this viciously tortured epic. Contradictions in Cato's characterization do not point to a subversive cynicism typical of a late twentieth century deconstructionist, but rather to the troubled political beliefs of a young aristocrat who struggled to find a satisfactory solution in the options offered to him, since in the end resistance had become almost, but not quite, purely rhetorical.

Stoische Erneuerung der epischen Tradition – Der Bürgerkrieg als Schicksal und die Entscheidungsfreiheit zum Verbrechen

CLAUDIA WIENER

Es gehört heute Mut dazu zuzugeben, Lucans Epos als das Werk eines Stoikers zu verstehen. Denn sofort gilt man als typisch deutscher und langweiliger Philologe, der den literarischen Protest des aufbegehrenden Dichters angesichts der Erfahrungen eines Bürgerkriegs und seiner Folgen verniedlicht und damit unempfindlich für die faszinierende Modernität der *Pharsalia* bleibt, wenn er sie pedantisch in das Korsett einer festgelegten Weltdeutung und philosophischer Orthodoxie pressen will.

Ich möchte trotzdem mutig und langweiliger Philologe bleiben, weil ich den Verdacht habe, dass hinter der Ablehnung einer stoischen Deutung oft ein simplifiziertes Bild der kaiserzeitlichen Stoa steht. Wenn dabei der Optimismus der Stoa und der Glaube an die „supreme justice and benevolence"[1] hervorgehoben wird, von dem sich Lucans Autor- bzw. Erzählerpassagen tatsächlich so deutlich absetzen, sollte vorab rekonstruiert werden, ob und wie sich kaiserzeitliche Stoiker Gerechtigkeit mit Güte der göttlichen Weltenlenkung vereinbar denken. Denn nicht nur Lucan, auch die kaiserzeitliche Stoa ist faszinierend modern! Der zeitnächste (und mit Lucan verwandte) stoische Autor L. Annaeus Seneca befasst sich gerade mit der Theodizee-Problematik besonders intensiv, sogar mit derselben Bürgerkriegssituation, nämlich am Beispiel des Cato in *De providentia*. Das Grundproblem dabei bleibt bei beiden Autoren ein Hauptthema: Auch wenn die stoische Theologie von einer göttlichen Fürsorge für die Menschen ausgeht, kann es sich dabei nicht um eine Fürsorge für das Wohlbefinden jedes einzelnen Menschen handeln, weil sie auf den Erhalt des gesamten Kosmos ausgerichtet sein muss. Da also an dieser Vorgabe nichts zu ändern ist, muss die Stoa einen Ausweg finden, das Individuum gegen Schicksalsschläge und Lebenssituationen, die man als Unglück bezeichnen würde, zu wappnen; sie tut das, indem sie eine persönliche Umbewertung solcher Situationen einübt: Schicksalsschläge sind keine *mala*,

1 Feeney 1991: 283.

sondern Bewährungsproben der *virtus* (u.a. Sen. *dial.* 1,3). Seneca rettet die Fürsorge der Götter, indem er ihnen das Erziehungskonzept eines strengen Vaters unterstellt, der die viel versprechenden Söhne nicht verweichlicht, sondern durch schwierige Situationen stärkt (*dial.* 1,1). Die Spannung zwischen den Ansprüchen des Individuums und den übergeordneten Naturgesetzlichkeiten, die für das Individuum eine vernichtende Katastrophe bedeuten, wird von Lucan als zentrales Problem des Epos gestaltet.

Ich möchte behaupten: Gerade weil Lucan in einem stoischen Umfeld schreibt, drängt sich ihm das Bedürfnis auf, die historischen Erfahrungen der jüngeren römischen Geschichte und das eigene Lebensgefühl im Prinzipat mit einer Idealvorstellung vom Leben in Freiheit zu kontrastieren. Und ich möchte behaupten: Gerade weil Lucan eine stoische Basis hat, kann er so weit gehen, die Form des Epos mit ihren festen Konventionen der längsten literarischen Gattungstradition zu wählen, um dieses Spannungsverhältnis von inneren Problemen, die den festgesteckten formalen Rahmen zu sprengen drohen, evident zu machen.

Deshalb soll im Folgenden dreierlei gezeigt werden. Erstens kann Lucan mit auffälligen formalen Innovationen gegenüber der Gattungstradition auf stoische Anregungen zurückgreifen, ohne diese Lehre damit *ad absurdum* zu führen, wie das vielfach behauptet wurde.[2] Denn es ist die Metho-

2 Mit Berufung auf Hartmut Friedrich 1938 wird in Deutschland seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg Lucans antivergilische Haltung mit einer antistoischen Tendenz verbunden, wobei die Interpretation von Berthe Marti 1945 auf entschiedene Ablehnung stößt (Rutz 1984), ähnlich Due 1962 und 1970; die Dissertation von Schotes 1969 hat mit beachtlichem Rezeptionserfolg nachzuweisen versucht, dass Lucan in Physik und Psychologie orthodox stoisch bleibt, nur im Bereich der stoischen Theologie als Kritiker des Systems auftritt. Weniger fixiert auf die Frage nach der orthodoxen oder kritischen Beziehung zur Stoa sind Untersuchungen zu *Fatum* und *Fortuna* im Umfeld von Ahls Lucan-Studien (1974, 1976). Die intertextuelle Methode zum Nachweis von Lucans antiaugusteischer Haltung hat Narducci 1979 noch mit einem stoischen Geschichtsmodell bei Lucan verbunden, rückte davon aber schrittweise (1985 bis 2002 und 2004) ab in Richtung der Pessimismus-Deutung, deren am nachhaltigsten wirkender Vertreter wohl Johnson 1987 ist (zuletzt bisher Sklenář 2003). Narducci hat sich 1999 freilich schärfstens und entsprechend spektakulär gegen die dekonstruktivistische Deutung Hendersons gewandt, dessen produktive Wirkung auf die anglo-amerikanische Forschung nicht unterschätzt werden darf, weil er die Freiheit propagiert hat, in Lucans Epos Widersprüchlichkeiten aufzufinden und als Aussage des Textes zu deuten. Aus solchen Anregungen ergibt sich die Forschungstendenz, auffallende Bildbereiche (etwa die Destruktion von Körpern, vgl. das Kurzresümee bei Bartsch 2005) metaphorisch als poetologische Manifestation zu deuten (umfassend Masters 1992) und die Erzählerrolle mit mehr oder weniger narratologischer Präzision zu untersuchen. Jula Wildberger 2005 als Stoa-Expertin schlägt einen neuen Ansatz zwischen den polaren Positionen der stoischen und anti-stoischen Deutung vor; sie erklärt Lucans Umgang mit

dik der stoischen Logik, es sind die Geschichtsauffassung und die Psychologie der Stoa, die Lucan erst die hochdifferenzierte Analyse ermöglichen, mit der er die Entstehung und Entwicklung des römischen Bürgerkriegs auf verschiedenen Ebenen beobachtet und zu erklären versucht. Zweitens: Von der Stoa favorisierte psychotherapeutische Techniken wie die *praemeditatio malorum* und die Situationsumbewertung gewinnen im ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert einen solchen Einfluss, dass sie auch auf die literarische Gestaltung Einfluss nehmen. Der Erzähler Lucan und seine Leser praktizieren nichts anderes, als sich in die schrecklichen Situationen eines unausweichlichen Bürgerkriegs mit allen verheerenden Konsequenzen hineinzuversetzen und sich zugleich als Zuschauer im Welttheater aus göttlicher Distanz daran zu delektieren. Und damit ist als abschließender dritter Abschnitt zu betrachten, welches Gottesbild Seneca in seinen philosophischen Schriften vermittelt, um es mit Lucans epischer Konzeption zu vergleichen.

1. Geschichtsdeutung: Der Verzicht auf den Götterapparat zugunsten einer Ursachenanalyse

Der Verzicht auf den Götterapparat ist umso spektakulärer, als damit nach antikem Verständnis ein entscheidendes Gattungsmerkmal fehlt; Servius sieht darin ein evidentes Unterscheidungsmerkmal zwischen Historiographie und Epik.[3] Denis C. Feeney 1991 hat bereits ausführlich dargelegt, dass im antiken Verständnis nicht so sehr unser Kontrastpaar von Mythos und Geschichte ausschlaggebend ist, dass aber im Unterschied zur Historiographie die Götter als handelnde Personen im Epos durchaus erwartet werden. Trotzdem bedeutet der Verzicht auf den Götterapparat

der Stoa mit einer neuen Perspektivierung; sein Epos verfolge keine stoische Aussage, sondern setze beim Leser die Kenntnis von ‚Stoizismen' im Sinne von Wertauffassungen und Deutungsmustern voraus und könne so auch die Auseinandersetzung des Leser mit diesen Deutungsmustern auslösen.

3 Serv. *Aen.* 1,382 MATRE DEA MONSTRANTE VIAM hoc loco per transitum tangit historiam, quam per legem artis poeticae aperte non potest ponere. nam Varro in secundo divinarum dicit ex quo de Troia est egressus Aeneas, Veneris eum per diem cotidie stellam vidisse, donec ad agrum Laurentem veniret, in quo eam non vidit ulterius: qua re terras cognovit esse fatales: unde Vergilius hoc loco "matre dea monstrante via" *et cripe, nate, fugam,* item nusquam abero *et descendo ac ducente deo* et iamque iugis summae surgebat Lucifer Idae. *quam stellam Veneris esse ipse Vergilius ostendit qualis ubi Oceani perfusus Lucifer unda, quem Venus ante alios astrorum diligit ignes.* quod autem diximus eum poetica arte prohiberi, ne aperte ponat historiam, certum est. Lucanus namque ideo in numero poetarum esse non meruit, quia videtur historiam composuisse, non poema. Vgl. Schmitz 2009: 553.

noch nicht, dass Lucans epische Welt ohne eine übermenschliche Wirkungsebene auskommt. Lucan verzichtet nicht generell auf überirdische Einwirkung – wie beispielsweise die Existenz einer Unterwelt in Erichthos Totenbeschwörung nicht in Frage gestellt oder zumindest mit Bezügen zur vergilischen Katabasis literarisch gerechtfertigt ist, wie auch die Berechtigung von Prodigien und die Aussagekraft von Mantik nicht bestritten ist: Das, was durch Haruspizin, Astrologie, Ekstase, Orakelbefragung und Totenbeschwörung verkündet wird, ist immer zutreffend,[4] wenn auch nicht immer für diejenigen Personen einsichtig oder relevant, die die Zukunft aus bestimmten persönlichen Gründen wissen möchten. Nicht die Mantik an sich wird kritisiert, sondern eine bestimmte Erwartungshaltung an die Mantik.[5]

Der Verzicht auf einen Götterapparat kann bestenfalls teilweise damit erklärt werden, dass Lucan die Epik säkularisieren und von naiven Göttervorstellungen befreien wollte. Denn gerade die Stoa hätte ihm mit der Tradition der Homer-Allegorese ausreichende Rechtfertigungsmöglichkeiten für den Einsatz des Götterapparats geliefert. Dass das engmaschige Netz an intertextuellen Bezügen zu Vergil die anti-augusteischen Aussagen des Epos unterstützt[6], ist unbestrittene *communis opinio*. Lucan verzichtet also damit demonstrativ auf die teleologische Geschichtsdeutung des augusteischen Epos – und des römischen Epos überhaupt, zumal sie bei ferner Vergangenheit unproblematischer zu gestalten ist als bei Zeitgeschichte. Wir haben immerhin für die Präsentation von zeitnaher Geschichte und ihrer Zielsetzung durch Götter Vergleichsbeispiele in Ciceros Urania-Rede und Ovids *Metamorphosen*, wo dieser gerade für die Zeitgeschichte, nämlich für die Ermordung Caesars, die Venus-Jupiter-Szene der *Aeneis* fortführt und anhand der ehernen *Fata*, die er *materialiter* vorweisen kann, das *Telos* von Caesars Existenz über den Tod hinaus und das *Telos* der römischen Geschichte über Caesars Ende hinaus demonstriert. Gerade hier wird auch die panegyrische Ausdrucksform bis zur Peinlichkeit evident.

Lucan verzichtet mit dem Götterapparat grundsätzlich auf die Artikulation einer Zielvorstellung, weil die Götter nur das Ende Roms, aber kein Ziel zu rechtfertigen hätten. Das notgedrungen in der Widmungsadresse panegyrisch vorgegebene *Telos*, Neros Regierung, wirkt nicht in das Epos hinein und wird an keiner dazu geeigneten Stelle aufgegriffen: nicht bei der Haruspizin, nicht bei der astrologischen Erkenntnis des Nigidius Figulus,

4 Auch die Antiwelt der Erichtho ist kein Chaos, sondern eine ‚komplementäre Weltordnung', wie Nicola Hömke 1998 gezeigt hat.

5 Vgl. Ahl 1976: 121-130 zur Appius-Szene in Delphi; Hömke 1998 zur Erichtho-Szene.

6 Narducci 1979.

nicht in der Ekstase der römischen Matrone, nicht bei Erichtho, nicht in der Klage des Autors bei Pharsalus. Man könnte einwenden: Auch Statius hat die Bürgerkriegsthematik in seiner *Thebais* aufgegriffen und mit Götterapparat die Vernichtung der Herrscherhäuser von Theben und Argos begründet – ähnlich hätten wir uns wohl auch einen römischen Bürgerkrieg mit Götterapparat vorzustellen; doch hat Statius eine Interpretation des Bürgerkriegs für die römische Geschichte nicht gewagt – zumindest nicht explizit.

Das einzige Bürgerkriegsepos mit explizit teleologischer Geschichtsdeutung, das wir neben Lucan besitzen, ist die Kostprobe, die Petron seinen Dichter Eumolp geben lässt: Das *Bellum civile* wird von Eumolp als eine stilistische Erneuerung der Epik im Sinne Vergils präsentiert; als qualitative Kriterien nennt er zum einen den Götterapparat, d.h. geschichtliche Interpretation *per ambages*[7], und zum anderen wendet er sich programmatisch gegen die zeitgenössische Manier, die glaubt, nur rhetorische *sententiae* auf die hohe Gattung der Dichtung übertragen zu müssen.[8]

Eumolps Bürgerkriegsfragment gilt wegen dieser Einleitung als Reaktion auf Lucans Epos. Wie begründet er also die historische Unausweichlichkeit des Bürgerkriegs? Eumolp verarbeitet das geläufige Dekadenzmodell der römischen Geschichte, indem er sich ganz auf die moralische Anprangerung der *luxuria* konzentriert; Luxusgüter aus aller Welt werden verschlungen, Spiele mit seltensten Tieren bestückt; erotische Lust und früh kastrierte Eunuchen pervertieren die Naturgesetze; die Politik ist zum reinen Stimmenkauf verkommen: Rom kennt keine moralischen Werte mehr. Der Bürgerkrieg wird als eine therapeutische Radikalkur für die verkommene Menschheit begründet (Petr. *Sat.* 119):

> hoc mersam caeno Romam somnoque iacentem
> quae poterant artes sana ratione movere,
> ni furor et bellum ferroque excita libido?

Fragen wir nach der Konsequenz dieses Deutungsangebots: Hat diese radikale Maßnahme denn eine nachhaltige Wirkung gezeigt? Das hieße, dass Eumolp die eigene Zeit als eine Epoche deuten müsste, in der die römische *virtus* wieder geheilt ist. Eumolps Dichtung bleibt Fragment und enthebt ihn der Verantwortung, diese Exposition zu Ende zu führen. Doch schon der auf diese Weise eingeführte Götterapparat lässt tatsächlich befürchten, dass mit dem Bürgerkrieg nicht wie bei Lucan das Weltende droht,

7 Vgl. dazu Feeney 1991: 262-264.

8 Gerade die *sententiae* sind natürlich ein Stichwort, das etwa an Frontos vernichtende Kritik des Lucan-Proöms denken lässt: Ein einziger Einfall (*plus quam civilia bella*) sei dort enervierend sieben Mal hintereinander variiert (*Ad M. Antonium de orationibus liber* cap. 6, van den Hout p. 155).

sondern eine Ausrichtung auf einen positiven Zielpunkt zu denken wäre – gar in der neronischen Zeit?!

Gerade im Vergleich zu Eumolps Kostprobe zeigt sich die intellektuelle Überlegenheit von Lucans Konzeption. Lucan beginnt sein Epos durchaus nicht emotionslos, aber doch mit der Distanziertheit eines Historikers, indem er eine differenzierte Ursachenanalyse dem Einsatz der eigentlichen epischen Handlung vorausschickt, die zwar eine moralische Dekadenz der römischen Gesellschaft ebenfalls feststellt, sie jedoch in einem wesentlich umfassenderen Kontext deutet. Lucan erweist sich als Kenner der stoischen Dialektik: Wie etwa Polybios' stoisches Geschichtsbild zwischen Ursachen und Anfängen unterscheidet, so konfrontiert uns auch Lucan mit verschiedenen Kategorien und einer streng hierarchischen Gliederung von Ursachen für die Analyse des geschichtlichen Prozesses.

Im Unterschied zu Petrons Epiker setzt Lucan an den Beginn seiner Bürgerkriegshandlung keinen strafenden Gott, sondern ein allgemeines Naturgesetz: Auf jeden Aufstieg muss der Fall folgen – so ist es in jedweder Entwicklung angelegt, selbst der scheinbar ewige Kosmos ist diesem zyklischen Vorgang unterworfen: Die Ekpyrosis, die wie ein episches Gleichnis anmutet, fungiert innerhalb dieses argumentativen Kontextes nicht als Gleichnis, sondern als ein Beleg für die Allgemeingültigkeit und Unausweichlichkeit dieses Prozesses.[9]

Trotzdem genießt Rom selbst in diesem allgemein gültigen Prozess eine Sonderstellung als Weltmacht. Fortuna gönnt es keinem anderen Volk, Rom zu Fall zu bringen: Die Autodestruktion, die Selbstzerfleischung in einem Bürgerkrieg, ist das Privileg und die einzige Möglichkeit des Falls. Dazu sind verschiedene Voraussetzungen bereits erfüllt; Lucan gliedert sie in *causae ducum* und *populi semina belli*: Zunächst von Seiten der *duces*:

1. Die Regel der Unteilbarkeit von Herrschaft sorgt für die Instabilität des Triumvirats. Den historischen Beleg für die Allgemeingültigkeit dieser Regel liefern Romulus und Remus. Die *concordia discors* wird durch den Tod des Crassus und der Julia zerstört: zwei verbleibende Rivalen sind Konkurrenten, deren allgemeine Disposition (*aemula virtus*) gleich ist, deren persönliche Disposition (Lebensalter, Karrierestufen und Temperament) sich deutlich unterscheidet.

2. Der nächste Abschnitt der Ursachenanalyse ist dem *populus*, d.h. der sozialgeschichtlichen Entwicklung in Rom gewidmet. Auch hier konstatiert Lucan zunächst wieder die Allgemeingültigkeit des geschilderten Prozesses: *publica belli semina, quae populos semper mersere potentes.*

9 In ähnlicher Weise setzt Seneca in der *Consolatio ad Polybium* die Vergänglichkeit des Kosmos argumentativ ein, um die Gerechtigkeit des Schicksals zu demonstrieren, die sich darin manifestiert, dass alles ohne Unterschied dem Untergang geweiht ist (*dial.* 11,1).

Lucan verzichtet auf den moralischen Zeigefinger, den die detailverliebte Schilderung des Eumolp erhebt, indem er sehr sparsam bewertende Adjektive einsetzt: Er geriert sich nicht wie ein alttestamentarischer Prediger, der zur moralischen Umkehr mahnt, weil es unter der Voraussetzung, dass der Höhepunkt einer Entwicklung erreicht ist, keine rettende Umkehr gibt; so kann es auch nicht sein Ziel sein, Rom eine moralische Schuld am eigenen Untergang zuzuweisen, der vorprogrammiert ist. Deshalb bleibt Lucan in der Benennung der Missstände auf einem hohen Abstraktionsniveau – geradezu bild- und farblos im Vergleich zu den Schilderungen des Eumolp: Die Maßlosigkeit im Luxus und im Landbesitz wird als solche benannt; es wird auch konstatiert, dass sie zu moralischen Aufweichungserscheinungen führt, sichtbar in der Kleiderordnung und darin, dass natürlich niemand mehr sein Land selbst bestellt wie anno dazumal die Camilli und Curii. Trotzdem unterbleiben szenische Schilderungen von empörendem Luxusverhalten.

3. Diese allgemein für alle Völker gültige gesellschaftliche Entwicklung führt dank der speziellen Disposition des römischen Volks zu einem Bürgerkrieg: Denn der Römer ist charakterlich so disponiert, dass er Untätigkeit nicht ertragen kann; es ist die unausweichliche Konsequenz, dass er seinen Ehrgeiz, wenn sich außenpolitisch keine Gelegenheit bietet, im skrupellosen innenpolitischen Machtkampf zur Geltung kommen lässt. Folge des Konkurrenzdrucks ist die zunehmende Käuflichkeit des Wahlvolks, die zu wachsender Verschuldung und zu der pervertierten Situation führt, dass der Bürgerkrieg eine Hoffnung für die Verschuldeten darstellt.

Im Unterschied zu Eumolp, dessen argumentative Struktur (Unersättlichkeit als Hauptursache) die Käuflichkeit der Stimmen von seiten der Wähler und deren unersättlicher Habgier begründet, sieht Lucan den innenpolitischen Prozess als Ursache für den übertriebenen Geldbedarf, und er kleidet das Ergebnis in die kürzeste Sentenz *et multis utile bellum* (1,182) – ein Paradoxon, das ohne jegliche explizite Bewertung durch den Autor allein seine schockierende Wirkung tut.

Es wird dem Leser von Anfang an klar, dass eine solche Analyse nicht mit einer positiven teleologischen Geschichtsauffassung in Einklang zu bringen ist. Und es ist allgemein bekannt, mit welchen gestalterischen Mitteln Lucan gerade die Episoden der *Aeneis* in ihr Gegenteil verkehrt, die das *Telos* der Geschichte im augusteischen Zeitalter finden.[10]

Trotzdem vertritt Lucan keinen Geschichtspessimismus oder Fatalismus,[11] sondern er argumentiert auf der Basis des stoischen Determinismus. Er kann sich bei seiner Analyse auf die Richtigkeit der Naturgesetzlichkeiten verlassen, die ihn auch für die Geschichtsentwicklung einen Kreis-

10 Zuletzt Narducci 2002.

11 So Sklenář 2003.

lauf erschließen lassen: Nach dem Aufstieg muss ein Fall eintreten – aber auch auf einen Fall folgt wieder ein Aufstieg. Der Fall selbst ist allerdings eine Katastrophe für die Betroffenen, und Lucan selbst und seine zeitgenössischen Leser sind ebenfalls Betroffene und nach dieser Ekpyrosis des Bürgerkriegs an einen deprimierenden Anfangspunkt der Geschichte zurückgeworfen. Lucans Klage über das menschenleere Italien, seine Anti-Heldenschau und seine Anspielungen auf den Rückfall Roms in die romulische Königszeit zeigen uns sein Bild von der eigenen Gegenwart: Der Prinzipat erweist sich als eine Form der Königsherrschaft, eine unspektakuläre, unheroische Anfangszeit, aus der sich Rom erst wieder aufrichten muss. Die Unerträglichkeit, die der Verlust der Freiheit in dieser Herrschaftsform mit sich bringt, wird erst im siebten Buch artikuliert, in der Klage des Autors anlässlich der entscheidenden Schlacht.

2. Perspektivenwechsel: Den Weltuntergang miterleben – den Weltuntergang beobachten

Denis C. Feeney[12] hat mit erstauntem Tonfall konstatiert, es sei immer noch eine unverständlich hohe Zahl von Forschern, die es wagten, Lucan auf dem Prokrustesbett der stoischen göttlichen Vorsehung zu foltern. *Confiteor*: Auch ich gehöre zu diesen Sadisten. Denn die engagierte Autor- und/oder Erzählerrolle, die Lucan hier – mit nachhaltigem Erfolg – ins Epos eingeführt hat, mag zwar die Götter anklagen und im Entsetzen ihre Fürsorge für die Menschen leugnen, doch ist es auch für einen Autor mit stoischer Weltsicht keine Verpflichtung, sich selbst, wenn er zum Beobachter und Erzähler einer solchen Katastrophe wird, als ein stoischer Weiser affektlos zu gerieren – und selbst der stoische Weise kann angesichts des Weltuntergangs nicht regungslos und unbewegt bleiben, wie Lucans Cato im zweiten Buch zeigt. Natürlich kommen spontane Zweifel an der göttlichen Vorsehung, wenn sie etwas so Entsetzliches und moralisch Pervertiertes wie den römischen Bürgerkrieg geschehen lässt. Die Unmittelbarkeit des Erlebens innerhalb der Katastrophe führt konsequent zu Entsetzensäußerungen. Die Umkehr aller Werte im Verhalten der Menschen bleibt als Aussage des Epos bestehen und ist an sich erschütternd.

Von Wolf-Hartmut Friedrich und Georg Pfligersdorffer über die angloamerikanische Forschung bis zu Emanuele Narduccis jüngster intertextueller Lektüre der *Pharsalia* als Anti-*Aeneis* reichen die literaturhistorischen Studien, die in Lucan einen Vorläufer von Georg Büchner erkennen: einen Autor, der vom Fatalismus der Geschichte vernichtet ist, dieser Verzweiflung tief ergriffenen Ausdruck gibt. Auch ich nehme Lucan seine

12 Feeney 1991: 284.

Erschütterung durchaus als glaubwürdige Emotionsäußerung ab; auch ich glaube nicht, dass Lucans Autor- und Erzählerrolle allzu weit voneinander entfernt sind. Aber man sollte, bevor man auf Lucans Lebenseinstellung schließt und ihn als abtrünnigen Stoiker oder Nihilisten festlegen will, alle seine Aussagen und alle Erzählerrollen zusammen in den Blick nehmen.

Ich möchte behaupten: Gerade die unterschiedlichen Erzählhaltungen hat Lucan nicht nur beim Rhetoriklehrer mit den Schulungen in Ethopoiie gelernt, sondern in seinem stoischen Umfeld vertieft praktiziert. Aus Senecas Schriften, aus *De ira* wie aus den *Consolationes* kann man das Vorgehen der stoischen Psychotherapie rekonstruieren,[13] das eine Korrektur von falschen Vorstellungen (*opiniones*) beim Patienten dadurch erreichen will, dass er Situationen neu zu bewerten lernt. Das geschieht, indem der Therapeut den Patienten unterschiedliche Standpunkte einnehmen lässt: Man kann sich in eine andere Person hineinversetzen (als Jähzorniger in den vermeintlich Schuldigen, von dem man sich beleidigt fühlt, als Trauernder in den Verstorbenen, um sich bewusst zu machen, was dieser sich von uns erwarten würde; oder auch in die personifizierte Fortuna, von der man sich ungerecht behandelt fühlt) oder man kann, was schwieriger ist, einen erhöhten Standpunkt einnehmen und die Situation aus räumlicher oder zeitlicher Distanz betrachten lernen. Die Ursachenanalyse zeigt Lucan als den distanzierten Betrachter, der das Gesamtgeschehen im Überblick deuten kann. Er gibt uns aus dieser Perspektive von Beginn an zu verstehen: Die göttliche Vorsehung handelt nicht im Sinne des Individuums, sondern im Sinne des Erhalts des Universums. Erstes und oberstes Naturgesetz ist der Zyklus von Werden und Vergehen, der Fall, der auf den Aufstieg folgen muss. Auch Lucans Cato hat diesen Standpunkt, denn er wird in seiner Rede, mit der er Brutus seine Teilnahme am Bürgerkrieg erklärt, dasselbe Beispiel vom Weltuntergang zur Verdeutlichung einsetzen wie Lucan selbst in der Ursachenanalyse: Der Bürgerkrieg als Untergang der Gesellschaftsform der *libera res publica* entspricht dem Einsturz des Weltgefüges.

Aber neben der Distanzwahrung lehrt die stoische Psychotherapie auch die entgegengesetzte Perspektivierung – in aller Regel als Präventionstraining: Auf Krisensituationen bereitet man sich vor, indem man sie gedanklich vorwegnimmt.[14] Denn Haltung in einer schrecklichen Situation zu bewahren, in die man hineingeraten ist, kann man nur, wenn man sich vorher ein angemessenes Verhalten überlegt hat und es in regelmäßigem Training habitualisiert hat.

13 Vgl. dazu Wiener 2008.

14 Zur stoischen Meditationspraxis, die besonders in der Epiktet-Forschung herausgearbeitet wurde, vgl. Hijmans 1959; Newman 1989.

Blicken wir dazu auf Senecas Vorgehen, dessen stoische Grundhaltung nicht bezweifelt wird. Er hat in den *Naturales quaestiones* die Naturkatastrophen wie Flut und Erdbeben als Inferno geschildert, das der Leser mitzuerleben meint. Auch wenn Seneca das verheerende Erdbeben in Campanien im Jahre 62 zu Beginn des sechsten Buches schildert, als wolle er es den Leser hautnah erleben lassen, wird in diesem Zusammenhang doch keine Theodizee-Thematik, kein Zweifel an der Fürsorge der Götter artikuliert, die ein derartiges Unglück zulassen konnten. Vielmehr lautet die Botschaft, dass eine Naturkatastrophe zu akzeptieren und sogar vorauszusehen sein müsse, weil sie ein natürlicher Prozess sei. Mit der Vergegenwärtigung der Katastrophe intendiert Seneca stattdessen eine *praemeditatio mortis*, eine gedankliche Vorwegnahme des schlimmsten aller Fälle, in die ein Mensch geraten kann: Ohne Hoffnung auf Rettung und mit Todesgewissheit muss er sich bewähren; wie wichtig ihm diese paränetische Wirkung des Buchs (und der Naturbetrachtung überhaupt) ist, zeigt sich darin, dass er sie am Ende (6,32) erneut aufgreift. Und dass er dieses Verhalten für jeden Gebildeten voraussetzt, macht er in Brief 91 der *Epistulae morales* klar, als er angesichts der verheerenden Brandkatastrophe von Lyon zunächst zwar Mitgefühl mit dem betroffenen Liberalis bekundet,[15] nach dieser scheinbar mitfühlenden Einleitung jedoch im Fortgang des Briefes beweist, dass keine Katastrophe das Etikett ‚unvorhersehbar' verdient; er leitet daraus die allgemeine Pflicht ab, aus der *condicio humana* und dem Naturstudium (und allen Naturkatastrophen) erkennen zu lernen, dass überhaupt nichts unerwartet eintreten könne (*epist.* 91,9):

> Nihil privatim, nihil publice stabile est; tam hominum quam urbium fata volvuntur. Inter placidissima terror existit nihilque extra tumultuantibus causis mala unde minime expectantur erumpunt. Quae domesticis bellis steterant regna, quae externis, inpellente nullo ruunt: quota quaeque felicitatem civitas pertulit! Cogitanda ergo sunt omnia et animus adversus ea, quae possunt evenire, firmandus. Exilia, tormenta, bella, naufragia meditare. [...]

Die Bilder erinnern an Lucans Ursachenanalyse: Ganze Reiche kommen zu Fall – allein durch ihre *felicitas*. In einer solchen Lage befinden sich alle Beteiligten am römischen Bürgerkrieg: Sie sind in eine unaufhaltsame Katastrophe, in den Untergang ihrer Welt hineingeraten. Seneca gibt uns zu

15 Sen. *epist.* 91,1: *Liberalis noster nunc tristis est nuntiato incendio, quo Lugdunensis colonia exusta est; movere hic casus quemlibet posset, nedum hominem patriae suae amantissimum. Quae res effecit, ut firmitatem animi sui quaerat, quam videlicet ad ea, quae timeri esse putabat, exercuit. Hoc vero tam inopinatum malum et paene inauditum non miror si sine metu fuit, cum esset sine exemplo; multas enim civitates incendium vexavit, nullam abstulit.*

verstehen, dass eine solche Situation nie außerhalb unseres Erfahrungshorizontes liegen muss, sondern immer eintreten kann. Deswegen ist es kein bloßes Gedankenspiel, das historische Geschehen nachzuempfinden. Mit seiner Erzählerhaltung ermöglicht es uns Lucan, die Dimensionen einer solchen Katastrophe mitzuempfinden. Damit wir uns in den Untergang der alten römischen Welt mit all seinen Konsequenzen für die betroffenen Menschen hineinversetzen können, gibt der Erzähler selbst immer wieder seine distanzierende allwissende Erzählhaltung auf.[16] Wenn er seine Personen anspricht, ihre getroffene Entscheidung zu revidieren, tut er so, als könnte er sie mit Mahnungen und Argumenten vom Irrtum abhalten, ja er unterstellt sich selbst die Möglichkeit, eine Umentscheidung herbeizuführen. Für einen Erzähler vergangener Ereignisse ist ein solches Verhalten eigentlich sinnlos; aber es dient dazu, die zeitliche Distanz aufzuheben und die erzählten Abläufe illusionistisch zu vergegenwärtigen.

Dabei gibt uns Lucan aber zusätzlich den großen Unterschied dieses Bürgerkriegs zu einer Naturkatastrophe, wie sie Seneca schildert, zu verstehen: Die Betroffenen sind gezwungen, diese Katastrophe sogar selbst zu verursachen. Und mit dieser Schuldfrage wird es doch wieder notwendig, neben dem Einfühlen in die Situation eine intellektuelle Distanz zur Bewertung der Lage einzunehmen.

Lucans Epos präsentiert uns auf der Bühne der Welt die verschiedensten Charaktere, die diese ihre Lage unterschiedlich schnell erkennen, unterschiedlich bewerten und unterschiedliche Handlungskonsequenzen daraus ziehen. Wie im Theater werden wir auch als Leser nicht ständig kritische Distanz bewahren, sondern die Krisensituation mit den Figuren mitfühlen. So wird die Prävention der *praemeditatio malorum* auch anhand von historischer Vergangenheit möglich: indem man sich in die menschliche und politische Entscheidungssituation einer Person hineinversetzt und ihr Verhalten mit den moralischen Konsequenzen anschließend distanziert rational bewertet.

Mit einem Beispiel aus Senecas Dialogen lässt sich zeigen, dass die Stoa der Kaiserzeit gerade anhand des Themas Bürgerkrieg diese Welttheater-Perspektive empfiehlt. Das bedeutet letztlich nichts anderes, als uns, den Lesern, in der Perspektivierung der Ereignisse tatsächlich eine ὁμοίωσις θεῷ zu verschaffen: Den Göttern gleich sind wir auf einen erhöhten Standort im Amphitheater der Welt erhoben. Genauso beschreibt nämlich Seneca in *De providentia* (*dial.* 1,2,9-10) die Perspektive der Götter, die im Theater der Welt sitzen und Cato beim Selbstmord mit derselben Begeisterung zusehen, wie der Römer im Amphitheater einem tapferen Kämpfer in der Arena seine Sympathie schenkt, der den Angriff eines

16 Vgl. die aufschlussreichen Analysen ganzer Episoden bei Schlonski 1995.

Löwen mit dem Speer pariert.[17] Der Selbstmord Catos ist für Götter Unterhaltung auf hohem Niveau, und so gibt Jupiter Cato das Schwert in die Hand und lässt ihn sogar zweimal zum Suizid ansetzen.[18]

Aus dieser Analogie wird für uns ersichtlich, wie sich ein römischer Stoiker der Kaiserzeit einen ‚gütigen Gott' auch vorstellen kann; ich befürchte, einen solchen Götterapparat hätten wir für ein Bürgerkriegsepos zu erwarten – ohne dass er mit der Gottesauffassung der kaiserzeitlichen Stoa in Widerspruch geriete. Einen solchen Götterapparat finden wir bei Statius, wenn die Götter den Sturm auf Theben wie im Amphitheater sitzend beobachten – einzig Capaneus wird ihnen schließlich doch ein etwas zu gefährlicher Gladiator, weil er beinahe die Götterloge angreift.

Lucan hat sich dafür entschieden, den Leser anstelle der Götter in diese Arena des Welttheaters zu setzen und durch Erzählerkommentare sich selbst unter die Zuschauer zu mischen. In seinem Theater gibt es tatsächlich keinen *deus ex machina*; und der Augenblicksatheismus im Zusammenhang mit der Schlacht von Pharsalos ist angesichts des Ausmaßes der Katastrophe die zu erwartende Theodizee-Frage. Bei aller Sympathie für seinen Helden hätte Lucan uns wohl zu göttlichen Zuschauern gemacht und seinen Cato diesen zweifachen Selbstmord ähnlich durchführen lassen, wenn er das Epos hätte vollenden können. Ich befürchte: Er hätte damit eine schaurig-lustvolle Bewunderung für die stoische Haltung

17 Sen. *prov.* 2,7-10: *Miraris tu, si deus ille bonorum amantissimus, qui illos quam optimos esse atque excellentissimos vult, fortunam illis, cum qua exerceantur, assignat? Ego vero non miror, si aliquando impetum capit spectandi magnos viros colluctantes cum aliqua calamitate. Nobis interdum voluptati est, si adulescens constantis animi irruentem feram venabulo excepit, si leonis incursum pertulit, tantoque hoc spectaculum est gratius, quanto id honestior fecit. Non sunt ista, quae possint deorum in se vultum convertere, puerilia et humanae oblectamenta levitatis.*

Ecce spectaculum dignum, ad quod respiciat intentus operi suo deus, ecce par deo dignum: vir fortis cum fortuna mala compositus, utique si et provocavit. Non video, inquam, quid habeat in terris Iuppiter pulchrius, si convertere animum velit, quam ut spectet Catonem iam partibus non semel fractis stantem nihilo minus inter ruinas publicas rectum: Licet, inquit, omnia in unius dicionem concesserint, custodiantur legionibus terrae, classibus maria, Caesarianus portas miles obsideat, Cato, qua exeat, habet; una manu latam libertati viam faciet. Ferrum istud, etiam civili bello purum et innoxium, bonas tandem ac nobiles edet operas: libertatem, quam patriae non potuit, Catoni dabit. [...]

18 Sen. *prov.* 2,12: *Inde crediderim fuisse parum certum et efficax vulnus: non fuit diis immortalibus satis spectare Catonem semel; retenta et revocata virtus est, ut in difficiliore parte se ostenderet: non enim tam magno animo mors initur quam repetitur. Quidni libenter spectarent alumnum suum tam claro ac memorabili exitu evadentem? Mors illos consecrat quorum exitum et, qui timent, laudant.*

Catos in uns erregen wollen, wie Seneca sie für die Götter im Theater der Welt voraussetzt.

3. Entscheidungsprozesse in ausweglosen Situationen

Worauf es Seneca bei seiner Gladiatorenkampf-Analogie ankommt, ist die Bewährung der *virtus* in ausweglosen Situationen. Hier sind wir bei dem stoischen Grundproblem angelangt, das auch Lucan in seinem Epos immer wieder aufwirft. Sind Entscheidungen, die Menschen in so aussichtslosen Situationen treffen sollen, überhaupt noch freie Entscheidungen? Welche eigenverantwortlichen Entscheidungen kann derjenige, der den Weltuntergang miterlebt und selbst zum Untergang verdammt ist, überhaupt noch treffen? Nach Senecas stoischer Überzeugung sind das dieselben Willensentscheidungen, die jeder Mensch in jeder beliebigen Situation treffen kann und muss.

Für die entscheidende Frage, wie das Individuum innerhalb dieses Determinismus seine Entscheidung trifft, hat die Stoa im Bereich der Ethik ein Handlungsmodell entwickelt, das die Verantwortung des einzelnen innerhalb von festgelegten Prozessen gewährleisten soll. Wir reagieren immer auf Anstöße von außen, sozusagen auf Schlüsselreize, und zunächst sogar alle instinktiv gleich (προπάθειαι), doch im nächsten Schritt unterscheidet sich der Weise vom Toren.

Wie wir letztlich agieren, das liegt in unserer Entscheidungsgewalt; jede, selbst die ausbleibende, also unterdrückte Reaktion setzt nämlich eine Bewertung und damit eine rationale, bewusste Entscheidung für oder gegen eine Handlung voraus. Seneca hat dieses Handlungsmodell für den Bereich der Affekttheorie im zweiten Buch von *De ira* am klarsten vorgeführt (*dial.* 4,4). Es besteht aus drei Phasen: Der instinktiven körperlichen Reaktion auf eine Erfahrung/einen Reiz, dann der Evaluation/Bewertung dieses Eindrucks (*iudicium*) und schließlich der Entscheidung zum Handeln. Für den Affekt Zorn heißt das: Ich erhalte eine Ohrfeige (Schlüsselreiz), reagiere mit Zornesröte (instinktiv), bewerte dann die Situation („das ist ungerecht, das ist erniedrigend") und reagiere, indem ich dem Provokateur ans Schienbein trete. Ein weiser Mann wie Sokrates hätte anders gehandelt. Er hätte sich gedacht: Der Mensch, der mir die Ohrfeige verpasst hat, steht so tief unter mir, dass ich ihn nicht beachten muss. So reagiert Sokrates mit einem witzigen Satz: „Es ist schade, dass der Mensch nie weiß, wann er mit Schutzhelm aus dem Haus zu gehen hat".

Bei Lucan erfährt dieses Handlungsmodell im Epos folgende Umsetzung: Die Römer erfahren von Caesars Zug auf die Hauptstadt, Prodigien bestätigen den Ausbruch des Bürgerkriegs, sie spüren Angst. Auch Cato

kann seine Trauer nicht verhehlen. Die Stimmung ist wie in einem Haus, in dem die Todesnachricht eingetroffen ist, alles ist wie gelähmt. Doch nach dieser ersten unwillkürlichen Reaktion auf die Situation muss eine Reflexion einsetzen, um die Entscheidung zum weiteren Handeln herbeizuführen: Nehme ich am Krieg teil oder kann ich mich isoliert absetzen?

Lucan hat diesen Entscheidungsprozess im Epos so konsequent umgesetzt, dass er ausnahmslos bei jedem Beteiligten am Bürgerkrieg diese rationale Zusage für den Leser nachvollziehbar vorführt – selbst bei den anonymen Personengruppen, wie den Soldaten. Viele der sogenannten Massenszenen sind damit motiviert.[19]

Die erste und die schnellste Entscheidung trifft erwartungsgemäß Caesar. Als Verursacher des Bürgerkriegs soll Caesar diese Entscheidung natürlich so treffen, dass wir als Leser sie miterleben können. Um diesen inneren Vorgang sichtbar zu machen, greift Lucan zu einem epischen Mittel, auf das er sonst verzichtet: auf die Erscheinung der *Patria*, die die Römer am Rubicon vom Einmarsch abhalten will.[20] Was uns mit dieser Vision der *Patria* vorgeführt wird, ist – wenn schon nicht Caesars Gewissen – doch immerhin der Ansatz von Skrupeln als unwillkürliche Reaktion (es sträuben sich ihm die Haare, was zum einen als Ausdruck der unbeeinflussbaren Instinktreaktion der προπάθεια gedeutet werden kann, zum anderen als die typische Reaktion des epischen Helden, die wieder ins Gegenteil verkehrt wird, weil Caesar konträr gegen die Anweisung der Vision handelt[21]) und zugleich die bewusste moralisch falsche Entscheidung für die gegenteilige Handlungsweise, die in dieser Szene mit Hilfe der Erscheinung beinahe dialogisch in Worte gefasst werden kann.

Die nächste willentliche Entscheidung für den Krieg müssen Caesars Soldaten fällen. Sie sind nicht missbrauchtes Instrumentarium eines Größenwahnsinnigen, Caesar muss ihre Zustimmung erst gewinnen, um den Krieg führen zu können. Doch Caesars Rede, die den Krieg als gerechte Verteidigung der römischen Freiheit darzustellen versucht, zeigt nicht die gewünschte Wirkung. Lucan betont, dass die patriotische Bindung bei den Soldaten stärker wirkt als die beruflich bedingte moralische Desensi-

19 Zu den Massenszenen als auffallendem Phänomen von Lucans Epos vgl. zuletzt Gall 2005.

20 Gall 2005: 97-99 macht zu Recht darauf aufmerksam, dass *Patria* nicht Caesar allein anspricht, sondern die *viri* (1,190-192); freilich leitet der epische Erzähler die Szene so ein, dass die *imago* nur dem Feldherrn selbst erscheint (1,186), die formelhaften Fragen dienen natürlich als Verweis auf die epischen Standard-Szenen (vgl. Maes 2005: 15). Trotzdem ist hier durchaus in Betracht zu ziehen, dass Lucan das Heer als Verantwortungsträger mit einbeziehen wollte, wie es Gall an dieser Stelle hervorhebt; denn auch diese Männer müssen gleich im Anschluss an die *Patria*-Vision dieselbe Entscheidung treffen.

21 Maes 2005.

bilisierung (*caede ferae mentes, dirus ferri amor*) und die Autorität des Feldherrn (*ductoris metus*):

> Dixerat, at dubium non claro murmure volgus
> secum incerta fremit: Pietas patriique penates
> quamquam caede feras mentes animosque tumentis
> frangunt, sed diro ferri revocantur amore 355
> ductorisque metu.
>
> (1,352-356)

An dieser Stelle könnte der Krieg bereits zu Ende sein – doch wir erleben, wie die Überzeugung zum falschen Handeln durch Rhetorik erreicht wird. Die Rede des *primipilus* Laelius ist es bei Lucan, die den Truppen schließlich doch alle moralischen Bedenken nimmt, indem sie den unbedingten Gehorsam des Soldaten zur unumstößlichen Pflicht erklärt und Caesars Willen zum höchsten moralischen Gebot erhebt – selbst wenn er befehlen sollte, Rom zu zerstören. Jetzt erst lassen sich Caesars Soldaten mitreißen und geben ihrer Entscheidung Ausdruck, indem sie sich gestisch ausdrücklich zum Einmarsch bereit erklären[22] (1,386-388):

> His cunctae simul adsensere cohortes
> elatasque alte quaecumque ad bella vocaret,
> promisere manus. It tantus ad aethera clamor [...]

Unerwartet, aber rational begründet fällt Catos Entscheidung für den Bürgerkrieg aus; er erläutert Brutus seine Beweggründe zur Teilnahme mit dem Wissen um die Unumgänglichkeit des Untergangs (man denke an Lucans Ursachenanalyse: Cato weiß um das Naturgesetz und erkennt die Vorzeichen des Untergangs) und mit der moralischen Pflicht zur Teilnahme am Begräbnis der *libera res publica*. Cato kann (noch) nicht, wie es Brutus suggeriert, als unbeteiligter Gott über den Turbulenzen der Gewitterwolken schweben. Dorothee Gall[23] sieht auch für Cato eine Schuld in der Bereitschaft zur Teilnahme an dem als Frevel erkannten Krieg parallel zu den Soldaten Caesars. Doch besteht ein deutlicher Unterschied

22 Unabhängig davon, dass es sich bei *it tantus ad aethera clamor* um eine epische Standardformulierung handelt – bei Vergil sind ähnliche Formulierungen an dramatischen Höhepunkten eingesetzt, und zwar sowohl für unheilvolles Getöse während der Kriegshandlung als auch für die Klage vieler Menschen, so bei der Einnahme Trojas *Aen.* 2,338 und 2,488, bei unerwartetem Geschehen im Kampf *Aen.* 11,745 (hier mit anschließendem Gleichnis), beim Tod der Dido *Aen.* 4,665, bei der Bestattung der Gefallenen *Aen.* 11,192, aber auch bei harmlosen Vorgängen wie dem Rufen der Mannschaft (*nautae*) bei der Fahrt auf dem Meer (*Aen.* 3,128; 5,140) – hat Dorothee Gall 2005: 99 hier zu Recht betont: „Weil sie ihre Chance vertan haben, die ‚Stimme der Vernunft' zu erheben, bleibt ihnen nur das unartikulierte Toben des Kriegslärms."

23 Gall 2005: 99.

in der Entscheidungsfindung, die bei Cato im Kontrast zu den rhetorisch manipulierten Soldaten auf ruhig getroffener, rationaler Überlegung beruht. Das wiederum bestreitet Jula Wildberger 2005; indem sie in Catos Rede diverse Widersprüche zur stoischen Doktrin aufdeckt, kommt sie zu dem Schluss, dass Catos Entscheidung für die Teilnahme am Bürgerkrieg von Lucan als eine Affekthandlung markiert wird; damit lasse der Epiker erkennen, dass das Verhältnis von Mensch und Natur gestört ist, da „eine ungestörte Ausübung der natürlichen Funktionen Urteilen und Handeln"[24] nur in Übereinstimmung des Menschen mit der Natur möglich ist.

Dem kann ich insofern zustimmen, als das normale Verhältnis von Mensch und Natur tatsächlich gestört ist. Cato erklärt selbst sein Verhalten – in dezidierter Absetzung von Brutus' Erwartung an das Verhalten eines stoischen Weisen – als etwas Besonderes: Ein Weltuntergang ist ein Ausnahmezustand. Cato kann deshalb nicht, wie Brutus die Normalvorstellung vom stoischen Weisen vorab formuliert, erhaben in einem Bereich außerhalb der Turbulenzen bleiben, weil kein Bereich seines Kosmos verschont bleibt. Und trotzdem handelt er stoisch, indem er dem Schicksal folgt. Zweifellos wird hier von Lucan die Situation als ein scharfes Paradoxon formuliert und zweifellos sollen wir uns damit auseinandersetzen – aber es ist ein Paradoxon, das die kaiserzeitliche Stoa selbst aufwirft, etwa in dem leider aus dem Kontext gerissenen Gleichnis vom Hund am Wagen.[25] Ob Cato damit moralisch ein falsches Urteil fällt, lässt sich erst im Rückblick beantworten: Cato bleibt der stoische Heilige – auch bei Lucan, er lässt ihn jedenfalls in keiner Schlacht gegen einen römischen Bürger kämpfen und kompromittiert ihn in keiner Szene seines Epos mit einer vom stoischen Standpunkt aus falschen Entscheidung. Demnach gibt Lucan seiner Figur recht, wenn sie den Göttern die Schuld an seiner Beteiligung am Bürgerkrieg gibt; indem Catos Integrität gewahrt bleibt, bleibt auch seine Freiheit, sich zur Teilnahme entscheiden zu können, bewahrt. Dass Cato mit seiner Entscheidung Brutus zu *nimii belli amores* motiviert, ist sicher vom moralischen Standpunkt aus eine bedenkliche Konsequenz – aber eher für Brutus als für Cato; angesichts der Schicksalsrolle, die Brutus als Caesar-Mörder übernehmen wird, muss dieses Verhalten des Brutus unausweichlich eintreten. Dass Cato damit persönlich schuldig wird, kann so nicht gesagt werden; erstens ist Brutus nach stoischen Kriterien für seine Entscheidung eigenverantwortlich und zweitens lebt Cato Brutus vor, wie man unschuldig durch das *summum nefas* des Bürgerkriegs gelangen kann.

Diese Formulierung stellt zudem mit einer intertextuellen Bedeutungsaufladung den Bezug zur Heldenschau in der *Aeneis* her. Lucan erinnert

24 Wildberger 2005: 72.

25 Zur Problematik vgl. Bobzien 1998: 349-357.

mit dem Schluss dieser Szene an die Aufgabe des Anchises (Verg. *Aen.* 6,888ff.), der mit dem Blick in die Zukunft Roms seinen Aeneas auf die Kriege in Italien vorbereiten soll:

quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit
incenditque animum famae venientis amore.
exin bella viro memorat quae deinde gerenda |...|.

Cato gibt Brutus Einblick in das Ende Roms, und die Szene schließt, indem über die Wirkung dieser Rede auf Brutus gesagt wird (2,323-325):

Sic fatur et acris
irarum movit stimulos iuvenisque calorem
excitat in nimios belli civilis amores.

Affekterregung mag nun nicht zu den Handlungen eines stoischen Weisen passen, aber Brutus' Schicksalsrolle als Tyrannenmörder erfordert eine solche Initiation. Wenn Lucan Brutus' Figur damit moralisch problematisch ausgestalten wollte, könnte er mit *nimios amores* durchaus auf eine nicht nur positive Bewertung von Brutus' Handlungsweise vorausverweisen. Wenn damit aber Cato kritisch gezeichnet werden sollte, ist das jedenfalls innerhalb des erhaltenen Epos nicht nachhaltig verfolgt. Durch den berühmten Vers *victrix causa deis placuit sed victa Catoni* (1,128) wird Cato dagegen explizit als moralische Instanz (*iudex*) eingesetzt, sogar den Götter gleichgestellt, allerdings ihnen auch gegenübergestellt. Sein Überblick ist ein göttlicher, seine Sympathie-Entscheidung dagegen eine menschlich-moralische, die der Autor Lucan teilt. Sie ist in größerer Freiheit getroffen, als es die Götter können, deren Bindung an das Naturgesetz sie zwingt, die moralisch eindeutig schlechte Seite der Bürgerkriegsparteien zu unterstützen – ein bedenkliches Paradoxon, das das stoische Lehrsystem an den Rand seiner Belastung bringt, aber zumindest im moralischen Bereich den Menschen die Entscheidungsfreiheit garantiert.

Anders in der Entscheidungsfindung verhält sich Pompeius mit seinen Soldaten, die dem Krieg zunächst mit der Flucht aus Italien auszuweichen suchen. Die Entscheidung der pompeianischen Soldaten für den Krieg fällt erst in Spanien, also im vierten Buch. Historisch belegt und in Caesars *Bellum civile* selbst ähnlich bewegend geschildert ist die Annäherung und Aussöhnung der sich gegenseitig belagernden Truppen bei Ilerda. Die Truppen erkennen die eigenen Verwandten und damit explizit den verbrecherischen Wahnsinn des Bürgerkriegs:

Postquam spatio languentia nullo
mutua conspicuo habuerunt lumina vultus,
deprensum est civile nefas.
(4,169-171)

Lucan schaltet sich hier als Erzähler ein und fleht die Göttin Concordia an, jetzt wirksam zu werden. Doch die Versöhnungsfeier wird von den Truppenführern der pompeianischen Seite unterbrochen. Die aufhetzende Rede des Kommandanten Petreius ist es, die Pompeius' Soldaten in diesem Augenblick doch noch zu Kriegsbefürwortern macht (4,235f.): *Sic fatur et omnis/concussit mentes, scelerumque reduxit amorem.* Lucan schließt einen sprechenden epischen Vergleich mit im Käfig gehaltenen Tieren an, die dressiert scheinen, aber mit einem Tropfen Blut ihre Dressur vergessen und wieder zu Bestien werden. Die Disposition zum Verbrechen des Bürgerkriegs ist da, die rationale Domestizierung nur von kurzfristiger Wirkung. Man kennt die Auswirkung von Petreius' Rede: Pompeius' Soldaten richten unter den vorher als Kameraden behandelten Caesarianern ein Blutbad an. Der Krieg ist mit dieser Entscheidung der einen Bürgerkriegspartei, die so lange tatenlos und damit unschuldig geblieben ist, unaufhaltsam geworden.

Seinen Pompeius lässt Lucan bis zur Schlacht von Pharsalos allerdings in unerträglicher Passivität verharren; immer von außen, erst von Caesar, schließlich von den Senatoren gedrängt, muss er handeln und letztlich gegen seinen Willen die Entscheidungsschlacht beginnen. Erst auf der Flucht nach Pharsalos lässt Lucan uns miterleben, wie in Pompeius die Erkenntnis reift, welche Rolle ihm in diesem Krieg zugedacht ist. Sein Märtyrertod in Ägypten, den Lucan mit einer Apotheose zu Beginn des neunten Buchs belohnt,[26] ist die folgerichtige Reaktion aus dieser schmerzlich gewonnenen Erkenntnis, die Lucans Cato von Anfang an hatte; es kommt nur noch darauf an, in diesem Untergang mit Haltung zu sterben.

Die Ästhetik des Grauenvollen, die Schilderung des Sterbens, wird uns wie Zuschauern in der Arena vorgeführt. Wenn wir die Haltung von Senecas Göttern einzunehmen wagten, könnten wir uns am heroischen Sterben derer delektieren, die das Schicksal diesem Weltuntergang ausgesetzt hat. Hier unterscheidet Lucan nicht zwischen Pompeianern und Caesarianern. Im Gegenteil scheinen es oft gerade Caesarianer zu sein, die heldenhaft wie Cato in den Freitod gehen. Die theatralische Szene des Selbstmords eines Vulteius und seiner Opitergini auf dem umzingelten Floß in der Morgendämmerung hat Matthew Leigh eingehend auf ihre *spectacle*-Qualität hin analysiert.[27] Scaevas Aristie in Dyrrhachium

26 Auch hier gebe ich Jula Wildberger 2005 in der Beobachtung recht, dass die Rückkehr der Seele des Pompeius zu den verbliebenen Protagonisten des Kriegs unerwartet ist. Das bestätigt meiner Ansicht nach jedoch die Richtigkeit von Catos Analyse der Situation: Nicht einmal die glücklichen Seelen können von den Turbulenzen des Weltuntergangs frei bleiben; es ist unmöglich, im Weltuntergang unbeteiligter Beobachter zu bleiben; die Nekromantie in Buch 6 beweist zudem, dass sogar die Unterwelt von den Tumulten erfasst ist.

27 Leigh 1997: 259-264.

erhält ihre Besonderheit gerade dadurch, dass das Heldentum durch die Zielsetzung im Bürgerkrieg pervertiert scheint.[28] Was Lucan uns hier als Schauspiel bietet, ist das heroische Agieren der Figuren in einer Arena, aus der es kein Entrinnen gibt.

Lucan ist dann anklagender Erzähler, wenn er an die Auswirkungen auf die eigene Zeit denkt; das aber nicht, weil er an der stoischen Weltdeutung zweifelte, sondern weil es schwer ist, das in diesem Prozess erkennbare Naturgesetz angesichts der individuellen Leiden der Betroffenen anzuerkennen. Keine mangelnde Fürsorge der Götter, sondern die über ihnen stehende Natur ist schuld am Untergang Roms, der deswegen akzeptiert werden muss, auch wenn schon das Zusehen in manchen Situationen nicht mehr heroisch, sondern so quälend ist, dass der Erzähler das Rad der Geschichte zurückdrehen möchte. Ob Lucan am Ende zu einem weiseren Erzähler wie Seneca mutiert, der in den *Dialogi* explizit die Verteidigung der Götter in der Theodizee-Thematik übernimmt, wissen wir nicht, wagen es aber zu bezweifeln. Dass Lucan nicht die Götter, sondern uns Leser ins Amphitheater der Weltgeschichte gesetzt hat, das macht seine Modernität aus.

28 zuletzt dazu Leigh 1997: 158-160, 221; Schmitz 2007: 239 und Hömke in diesem Band.

... und es bewegt sich doch! Der Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes

MARTIN DINTER

Die Beschreibung eines Enthaupteten bereitet den meisten von uns wenig Freude. Schlimmer noch erscheint uns der Gedanke an einen enthaupteten Störtebeker, der kopflos seine Mannen abschreitet, oder – vielleicht realistischer – der Gedanke an derweil zum stehenden Ausdruck gewordene kopflose Hühner, die mit scharrenden Füßen ins Nachleben torkeln.[1] Totes wünschen wir uns eher leblos. Unserem modernen Geschmack zum Trotz konfrontieren die lateinischen Epiker ihr Publikum mit immer detaillierteren Beschreibungen von Gewalt, Verstümmelungen und Wunden. Anhand einer statistischen Untersuchung hat Glenn Most die „overwhelming preference among all epic poets for puncture wounds" nachgewiesen.[2] Darüber hinaus weist er auf einen Anstieg detaillierter Schilderungen von Schwerstverletzungen und Amputationen im Werk Lucans hin (und dasselbe mag durchaus auch für Ovids *Metamorphosen* gelten).[3] Es ist viel über eine mögliche Inspiration dieser Schilderungen durch die Zergliederung von Tieren und Menschen in Opferriten und in Zirkusspielen geschrieben worden.[4] Gleichzeitig haben die bühnentauglichen Eigenschaften epischer Literatur viel Aufmerksamkeit gefunden: Man gesteht dem epischen Genre nun zu, dass es sich durchaus von der Bühne inspirieren lässt.[5] Umso überraschender erscheint es dann, dass insbesondere die Beschreibungen von Grausamkeiten vermehrt hyperrealistische Körperfunktionen beinhalten, die der Autor auf keinen Fall in der Arena beobachtet haben kann, da sie physisch nicht möglich sind. Einerseits können diese Hyperrealismen als ein Versuch interpretiert werden, die konventionelleren Zirkusspiele mit

1 Auf der Webseite http://www.miketheheadlesschicken.org können Informationen zu diesem Thema bequem abgerufen werden. Ich verdanke diese Referenz einem freundlichen Hinweis von Dr. Polly Low, University of Manchester.

2 Most 1992: 398ff.

3 Segal 1998: 32.

4 Cf. Most 1992: 401 und Coleman 1990 insbesondere für die Interdependenz von Zirkusspielen und Literatur. Foucault 1979: 7ff. sieht Folter als öffentliches Spektakel; für öffentliche Vivisektionen vgl. Selinger 1999: 32.

5 Rosati 1983: 95ff.; Feldherr 1998: 4-18; Leigh 1997: Kapitel 7; Hardie 2002.

den Mitteln der Literatur auszustechen. Andererseits sind diese Beschreibungen sicherlich auch Teil des omnipräsenten Bestrebens der epischen Epigonen, ihre literarischen Vorbilder zu übertrumpfen. Daher sind die bildmächtigen graphischen Gewaltdarstellungen in den Epen der Kaiserzeit oft als Ausdruck der Dekadenz kaiserzeitlicher Literatur und ihrer barocken Ausgestaltung missverstanden worden.[6] Erst in jüngerer Zeit hat man sich für die Rehabilitation und Aufwertung eben dieser Gewaltdarstellungen stark gemacht.[7] Mein Anliegen ist hier, die Reputation des abgehackten Körperteiles im Besonderen zu verbessern.

Im Epos dient Blutvergießen traditionsgemäß dazu, die Tapferkeit eines einzelnen Helden zu unterstreichen. Der Held kämpft gewöhnlich gegen Heerscharen unterlegener Feinde, welche erst dadurch ihre charakterisierende Funktion im Handlungsgeschehen des Epos erhalten.[8] Dieses Prinzip passt insbesondere in literarische Welten, in denen die sozialen Grenzen noch streng definiert sind, wie zum Beispiel in der *Ilias* und der *Aeneis*.[9] Mit Ovids *Metamorphosen* scheint allerdings eine Entwicklung einzusetzen, in der die Darstellung von Grausamkeit hauptsächlich der Unterhaltung oder Abwechslung zu dienen scheint und oft in deutlichem Kontrast zu den vorhergehenden und nachfolgenden Szenen steht.[10] Dieses Manko an offensichtlicher Funktion und Motivation findet seine formale Entsprechung in der Technik der isolierten Szene oder Einzelszene.[11] Diese Szenen entwickeln sich schließlich zu den detaillierten und intensiven Visionen des Terrors bei Lucan und Seneca dem Jüngeren. Hier wird der traditionelle epische Held zum stoischen Kontrapost, der seine Verletzungen und Verstümmelungen in emotionslosem Schweigen erträgt. Sein Blut bereitet den Weg für die frühchristliche Freude am Märtyrertum und an der Askese.[12]

Man war sich damals wie heute bewusst, dass ein Publikum nur eine begrenzte Menge Blutvergießen zur Kenntnis nimmt, bevor der Schock-

6 Siehe Regenbogen 1930 und die Diskussion in Segal 1984: 312.

7 Most 1992 und Segal 1998.

8 Cf. Strasburger 1954; neue Forschungsansätze zum epischen Katalog finden sich bei Gaßner 1972, Kühlmann 1973 und Reitz 1999.

9 Siehe Finley 1964: Kapitel 5 und Haubold 2000: 110.

10 Eine Ausnahme bildet *met.* 6,441-670, wo die Gewalt mit Sicherheit dazu dient, die Rache zu motivieren, allerdings kann man sie, wie wir sehen werden, auch noch unter anderen Aspekten betrachten. Eine Neubewertung traditionellen Heldentums mag sich aus Ovids Vermeidung einer weiteren Aristie des Perseus in *met.* 5,177ff. ablesen lassen. Siehe Segal 1985, Nagle 1988, Keith 1999.

11 Fuhrmann 1969: 66.

12 Cf. Prudentius *Psychomachia*, Clark 1998 und Spivey 2001: Abb. 9, 17 und 46-55.

faktor abebbt und es nach neuen Freuden Ausschau hält.[13] In der Tat hebt sich ein Automatismus eines abgehackten Gliedes durch seinen Hyperrealismus in einem solchen Maße von der ihn umgebenden Gewaltanwendung ab, dass man wohl mit Recht anehmen darf, dass er vom Publikum zur Kenntnis genommen wurde. Wie wir sehen werden, ist es gerade diese Eigenschaft, die den Automatismus zum bevorzugten Ort für Metapoetik, Ideologie und Zeitgeschichte werden lässt. Beispielhaft seien nur Lucans Verschmelzung von Philomelas Verstümmelung in Ovids *Metamorphosen* und Ödipus' Selbstblendung in der senecanischen Tragödie in *Bellum Civile* 2,181-184 angeführt.[14] Überdies kann die Verwundung und Zerstückelung des menschlichen Körpers zur Distanzierung Anlass geben und damit die Möglichkeit der Reflexion über die Bedeutung und Signifikanz des Körpers in seiner Gesamtheit eröffnen. Dies wird vom Soldaten Murrus im neunten Buch des *Bellum Civile* exemplifiziert, wenn er einen Teil von sich, nämlich seine Hand, sterben sieht und damit seinen eigenen Tod *en miniature* beobachten kann (Lucan. 9,832f.). Im Epos vergrößert die Verwundung eines Feindes den Ruhm (*kleos*) dessen, der verwundet. Gleichzeitig kommt der Ruhm des Verwundeten an seinem Endpunkt an und kann in Retrospektive analysiert werden. Der Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes stellt somit einen Störfaktor dar, da er die klaren Grenzen zwischen Tod und Leben verwischt, wenn ein Heroenschicksal sein tapferes Ende finden soll. Im Folgenden werden wir sehen, dass dieses insistierende (Nach-)Leben einzelner Körperteile eher ein selbstbewusstes ‚*vivat!*' versprüht als groteske Lust an Zerstörung, da gerade diese Szenen sich in das Gedächtnis der Leser einbrennen.

1. Vor Ovid

Das epische Motiv des Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes hat seine Wurzeln in Homers *Ilias* und *Odyssee* und findet sich in lateinischer Literatur zuerst im Kleinformat bei Ennius und Vergil.[15]

13 Segal 1998: 36.

14 Conte 1968: 234f.; Fantham 1992 *ad* 181-184; siehe Wills 1996 für die sprachtechnischen Aspekte lateinischer Anspielungen.

15 Cf. Friedrich 1948: 297ff. und Skutsch 1985: 644ff. für das Auftreten dieses Motives in den Alexanderromanen. Skutsch weist auf ein mögliches Vorkommen im hellenistischen historischen Epos hin und bezieht auch naturwissenschaftliche Literatur mit ein; siehe überdies auch King 1998: 222-224 über ‚wandering wombs'. In diesem Artikel möchte ich mich auf die epische Tradition beschränken: vgl. Fuhrmann 1968: 543: „Einzig beim Epos reichen die überlieferten Specimina für eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Betrachtung aus [...]." Homer, *Il.* 10,457 = *Od.* 22,329. (Köpfe); Eustathius (Vol. III,818) bietet die

Lukrez lässt uns auf seine Weise an seiner eher naturwissenschaftlichen Perspektive dieses Phänomens teilhaben.[16] Er benutzt das epische Repertoire, um seine atomistische Interpretation des Universums darzustellen. Dabei zieht er Parallelen zwischen der Fragmentierung eines Körpers und der Kleinteiligkeit der Atome, aus denen die Seelen und auch das Universum bestehen. Für Lukrez ist der epische Held Teil dieses Universums, und damit muss auch seine Seele mit seinem Tod wieder in einzelne Atome zerfallen. Seine philosophisch orientierte Lektüre Homers und Ennius' konzentriert sich daher nicht auf Aspekte der heroischen Tugend, sondern darauf, was es wirklich bedeutet zu sterben. Indem Lukrez Epen auf der Ebene von Atomen und nicht Kriegskunst betrachtet, bereichert er schlussendlich die epische Bildersprache. Homer beschreibt die Köpfe von Menschen, die niedergemetzelt werden, während sie um ihr Leben flehen. Die Grundidee hier scheint zu sein, dass Menschen schneller sterben können, als ihre Worte verwehen: Homers Szenen liefern somit Beispiele für die Vergänglichkeit und die Vergeblichkeit von Worten.

Im Gegensatz dazu konfrontiert Lukrez uns sowohl mit abgehackten Armen als auch Beinen, in denen noch die Überbleibsel einer zerstückelten Seele zugange sind. Dies macht unser Motiv für neue poetische Anwendungen zugänglich. Lukrez gibt dem Wort *semianimus* neuen Sinn. In seiner Weltanschauung bedeutet das Wort nicht mehr nur „halbtot", sondern buchstäblich „halb-beseelt", denn der Rest der Seele mag separat in einem anderem abgehackten Körperteil sterben. Lukrez spielt auf Homer und Ennius an, um diese für seine philosophischen Zwecke zu manipulieren und auszubeuten.[17] Vergil imitiert diese Autoren dann ebenfalls (*non solum sed etiam*), aber seine Lesart ist von Lukrez beeinflusst, und er bringt somit die philosophische Sichtweise des Lukrez in die *Aeneis* ein.[18] Schließlich finden wir in Ovid einen Autor, der auf alle seine vier Vor-

---

Variante ‚sprechender Kopf' für den Vers der *Ilias*. Enn. *ann.* 483-484 Skutsch (Kopf)= Servius *ad Aen.* 10,396. Für eine mögliche Imitation von *Il.* 10,457 in Ennius vgl. Skutsch 1985 *ad loc.*; überdies 485-486 Skutsch (*caput* mit Tuba) = Lactantius zu Stat. *Theb.* 11,56, bemerkenswerterweise das einzige Ennius-Echo in Statius. Verg. *Aen.* 10,395f. (Hand). Hierbei handelt es sich um eine Verstümmelung / *discrimen*, die dem Zwillingspaar Larides und Thymber zugefügt wird. Vgl. Harrison 1991 *ad loc.* Ennius, Vergil und Lukrez bilden den Hintergrund zu dieser Passage.

16 *Lucr.* 3,642-656; vgl. ebenfalls Segal 1990: 118-143: Lukrez zählt Körperteile auf, um die Sterblichkeit der Seele zu beweisen.

17 Für Ennius' möglichen Einfluss auf *Lucr.* 3,642ff. siehe Skutsch 1985: 646 und einführend 12.

18 Vgl. Hardie 1993: 74ff. und 117f.; Für Vergils Intertextualität mit Ennius 438-444 (Skutsch) vgl. *micant oculi / digiti* (*Aen.* 10,396). *Lucr.* 3,653 mag Inspiration für *digiti* geliefert haben; man vergleiche ebenso *caput a cervice revolsum* und Verg. *georg.* 4,523.

gänger zurückblickt und insbesondere durch seine Perspektive auf Lukrez die Wandelbarkeit des Körpers betont.[19] Insgesamt findet sich unser Motiv viermal in den *Metamorphosen*: zwei Köpfe, die über den Tod hinaus weiter murmeln, eine Hand, die weiter zuckt, und schließlich die über ihr Leben hinaus lallende Zunge Philomelas.[20]

Ovid zeigt die Tendenz, Personen in die *Metamorphosen* einzubauen, die den Dichter und seine Funktion als Erzähler abbilden.[21] Alle vier Automatismen in den *Metamorphosen* scheinen mir diesen – oftmals auch metapoetischen – Hintergrund aufzuweisen. Im Folgenden werde ich zeigen, dass die Gewalt in diesen Textpassagen nicht nur Ausdruck des schlechten Geschmacks oder der Faszination an Grausamkeit ist und auch nicht einfach nur die Irrealität des Geschehens unterstreicht.[22] Stattdessen entsprechen diese Automatismen den Ansprüchen, die an feinsinnige und selbstbewusste Dichtung gestellt werden, und verdeutlichen die Poetik der *Metamorphosen*. Mit Sicherheit stellen sie nicht einfach nur Blutvergießen um des Blutes willen dar.

2. Ovids Philomela

Philomelas Aktivität des Webens, um ihre verlorene Sprachfähigkeit zu ersetzen, wird im Allgemeinen als Metapher für literarische Produktion angesehen, und die ganze Episode kann unter dem Aspekt des Bruches mit sozialen Normen gelesen werden.[23] Der Topos des Webens findet sich ebenfalls in der Arachne-Episode im gleichen Buch (*met.* 5,1-145) und in der der Töchter des Minyas (4,1-415). Er verbindet somit Philomela mit weiteren Episoden, in denen das Erzählen von Geschichten eine wichtige Rolle spielt. Darüber hinaus schneidet Tereus mit der Zunge gerade das

19 Vgl. Segal 2001: 84ff.

20 Ov. *met.* 5,104-106 (Haupt des Emathion); *met.* 11,50ff. (Haupt des Orpheus). *met.* 5,115ff. (Hand des Barden Lampetides). *met.* 6,557 (Zunge Philomelas).

21 Zu internen Erzählern vgl. Barchiesi 2001; zu Künstlern (oft mit metapoetischem Hintergrund) vgl. Leach 1974, Lateiner 1984, Harries 1990, Anderson 1989; zum Lied der Calliope siehe Hinds 1987: Kapitel 4; für Orpheus, vgl. Segal 1989 und Knox 1986: Kapitel 4; zur die Rede des Pythagoras als empedokleisches Epos siehe Hardie 1995; zu den lykischen Bauern siehe Clauss 1989.

22 Williams 1978: 189-192 und 254ff. und Fuhrmann 1968: 37.

23 Segal 1994 unterstreicht die Bedeutung der Sprache in dieser Passage („central role of language" 267) und weist auf metapoetische Wortfelder wie die des Webens, Lesens, Schweigens, Überredens und Betrügens hin. Siehe insbesondere 264-269 für Philomela als Dichterfigur. Pavlock 1991 untersucht die Familienstrukturen, die in dieser Episode verletzt werden; siehe auch Otis 1970: 209-216 und Joplin 1991.

Organ aus Philomela heraus, durch dessen Benutzung sich der Mensch vom Tier unterscheidet. Damit Philomela ihr Menschsein behaupten kann, muss sie also ihre eigene Sprache erfinden, ein Verhalten, das eindeutige Parallelen mit der Io-Episode (*met.* 1,583-750) zeigt. Um die Bedeutung der Philomela-Episode in ihrem weiteren Umfeld zu beleuchten, werde ich untersuchen, inwiefern Ovids Gewaltdarstellungen hier dazu dienen, sich wiederholende Motive herauszuarbeiten und damit Philomela in das Geflecht der *Metamorphosen* einzubetten. Die Methodik des *Close Reading* wird helfen, die Details herauszuarbeiten, die ihre Zunge so wichtig werden lassen.

Wenn man schließlich das epische Vokabular von Gewaltanwendung und Verletzlichkeit in der Philomela-Passage in das des Freudschen Symbolismus übersetzt, findet man Untertöne eines erzwungenen Oralverkehrs.

Zum einen wird Tereus als *stimulatus* (Ovid *met.* 6,550) beschrieben. Wird diese Erregung durch die ihm zugeschriebene *ira* und *metus* verursacht oder eher von den Worten Philomelas und von Tereus wiedererwachter Lust? Tereus zieht sein Schwert, ein Phallussymbol, welches (wieder) zum Einsatz bereit steht (551).[24] Er greift Philomela beim Haar, und das Geschehen schreitet mit Fesselung fort (*vincla*, 553).[25] Philomela bietet tapfer ihre Kehle dar (*iugulum*).[26] Hier unterstützt die Syntax dieser Passage eine Interpretation der Zunge grammatikalisch und inhaltlich als *pars pro toto* für das Mädchen (*ille indignantem* |...| *vocantem* |...| *luctantem* |...| *conprensam* |...| *linguam*).[27] Daraufhin werden wir zu Zeugen eines Vorganges, der zumindest Spuren von *fellatio* in sich trägt: Tereus benutzt seine ‚Waffe' (d.h. phallus) in Philomelas Mund. Die Zuckungen ihrer Zunge könnten daher sogar in sexueller Hinsicht gedeutet werden. Ovid bietet seinem Publikum somit eine besondere Perspektive. Er fokussiert auf Philomelas Zunge, indem er das Innere nach außen kehrt und zwingt damit auch seine Leser, das Geschehen zu verinnerlichen. Die Vergewaltigung Philomelas, die zuvor nie explizit beschrieben wurde, dient hier als Subtext.

Die Zunge erlangt damit eine dreifache Funktion, die ihre starke Präsenz in dieser Passage rechtfertigt. Zum einen ist sie einfach ein Körperteil,

24 Adams 1982: 20f. bietet eine Sammlung von Beispielen für sexuelle Waffen-Metaphorik. *Accinctus* kann mediopassiv übersetzt werden „to get ready for action", siehe OLD und *met.* 7,47.

25 Für die Erotik des Haares siehe Apul. *met.* 2,8; Haare werden als Sitz des Lebens und der Macht interpretiert: Wer seinen Feind beim Haar packt, gewinnt Macht über ihn; geschorenes Haar ist ein Zeichen von Versklavung. Siehe Hurschmann 1998, Koetting 1986 und La Follette 1994.

26 „Throat-cutting equaled a defloration", Loraux 1987: 41.

27 Siehe Richlin 1992: 163.

zum anderen repräsentiert sie aber auch Philomela als *pars pro toto*.[28] Schließlich kann die Zunge auch als Verdinglichung der Sprache selbst gedeutet werden.[29] Damit erlangt durch die Zunge das Abstractum der Sprache eine dingliche Repräsentation im Text. Philomela verliert ihre Sprache mit ihrer Fähigkeit zu sprechen: *lingua* stirbt buchstäblich vor unseren Augen auf dem blutnassen Boden. Jedoch unternimmt die Zunge einen erfolglosen Versuch, zu dem Körper zurückzukehren, zu dem sie gehört. Sie ist bis zuletzt darauf aus, Philomelas Wunsch nach Sprache zu erfüllen.[30]

Dieser Versuch und Ovids Vergleich der Zunge mit einer Schlange erinnern an den ‚naturwissenschaftlichen' Zugang des Lukrez zum Thema der Verstümmelung.[31] Nichtsdestotrotz wird Ovids Episode verdeutlichen, dass, ebenso wie der Schwanz einer Schlange wieder wachsen kann, sich auch Philomela neue Wege der Kommunkation erschließen wird.

Schließlich signalisiert der langsame und mühsame Tod der Zunge auch, wie schwierig es ist, Sprache und insbesondere Gerüchte zu ersticken. Dies wird treffend durch die Beschreibung des mächtigen Hauses der *Fama* im zwölften Buch der *Metamorphosen* (12,39-63) und den Anspruch auf ein Nachleben durch Dichtung im Epilog (*vivam* 15,879) kontextualisiert. Man sollte auch nicht außer Acht lassen, dass der Körper der *Fama* bei Vergil aus einer Unmenge Zungen zusammengesetzt ist. Philomelas Zunge kann somit als eine Synekdoche für *Fama*, als eine lebende rhetorische Stilfigur gedeutet werden, wie sie sich für ein rhetorisches Epos schickt.[32] Ihre Zunge exemplifiziert detailliert, wie Worte vergeblich benutzt werden können, birgt aber gleichzeitig auch Konnotationen der Macht. Der Automatismus der herausgeschnittenen Zunge wirbt um die Aufmerksamkeit des Lesers für die vielen Interpretationsmöglichkeiten, die diese Passage bietet.

---

28 Vgl. oben für v. 555/6; überdies *ipsa iacet* (558), *tremens* (560: wie ein Gewaltopfer); siehe auch Richlin 1992: 163. Philomelas Name trägt etymologisch die Liebe zum Klang/Gesang in sich, sie verliert somit mit ihrer Sprachfähigkeit auch einen Teil ihrer Identität. Ovid lässt dazu noch ein Schoßtier-ähnliches Individuum als Spiegel der Emotionen seines Herrn fungieren.

29 Siehe Kaufhold 1997 für diese Terminologie und ebenso Mazzio 1997: 54.

30 Siehe Bömer 1969-1986 *ad loc.* Schweigen charakterisiert auch die Reaktion ihrer Schwester Procne (581).

31 Larmour 1990 vermutet, dass Iphigenies Tod (*Lucr.* 1,92-96) Vorbild für Philomelas Leiden (522ff.) ist.

32 Hardie 2002.

3. Totenlieder

Zwei der ovidischen Automatismen finden sich in der Kampfszene, die sich auf der Hochzeit von Perseus und Andromeda (*met.* 5.1-249) entwickelt, und betreffen infolgedessen fast hilflose und deplatzierte Charaktere: einen Barden und einen Greis. Die ganze Szene ist als Parodie des Epos interpretiert worden, und unser Motiv trägt dazu bei, diese Parodie zu kreieren.[33]

Der alte Emathion wird als gerecht und gottesfürchtig beschrieben (*aequi cultor timidusque deorum* 100). Obwohl er sich an einen Altar und damit ein Asyl geflüchtet hat, wird er hingemetzelt. Sein Tod dient offensichtlich dazu, seinen Mörder als einen Verächter der Götter (*contemptor divum*) im Stile des vergilischen Mezentius zu stilisieren. Die einzige Waffe des Greises ist das Wort (*loquendo pugnat* 101). Er benutzt Flüche, um sich zur Wehr zu setzen (*incesso* = „mit Worten angreifen"). Somit erinnert uns sein Tod um so mehr an den des Priamus im zweiten Buch der *Aeneis* (103; *Aen.* 2,534ff.). Hier verflucht Priamus Neoptolemus, bevor dieser ihn an einem Altar tötet. Da auch Emathion schließlich der Kopf abgehackt wird, darf man ihn wohl als ein weiteres Beispiel für die Nichtigkeit des Wortes sehen. In einem Epos, das so besessen von der Figur des Dichters und vom Dichten ist wie die *Metamorphosen*, bietet ein abgehackter Kopf, der mit den Waffen eines Dichters weiterkämpft, vielleicht die angemessenste Parodie eines epischen Blutbades und ein Äquivalent für die Schilderungen heroischer abgehackter Hände, die nach ihren Schwertern suchen (*Aen.* 10,395f.). Der Transfer der Dichterfigur in eine epische Kampfszene, wo sie sich mit den ihr gegebenen Waffen zur Wehr setzt, zeigt das Wort im Widerstreit: Die Waffen des Dichters sind seine Worte, mit welchen er sich als ‚Möchtegernheld' verteidigt, wenn er sich im Genre-Zerrspiegel einer selbstreflexiven Epentravestie wiederfindet. Lukrez hat durch seine Ausweitung des Topos vom Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes den nötigen Perspektivenwechsel und den nötigen theoretischen Hintergrund bereitet, um eine Abstraktion dieses Topos und eine Entwicklung über bloße Nachahmung hinaus zu ermöglichen. Sowohl Parodie als auch Metapoetik finden somit ihren Platz in Ovids Automatismen.

Der Barde Lampetides war ursprünglich eingeladen worden, um das Fest mit Gesang musikalisch zu umrahmen. Er ist kein kriegerischer Mann, sondern geht einer friedvollen Tätigkeit nach (*pacis opus*; *inbelle*). Lampetides bietet somit das Bild eines friedlichen, man möchte fast sagen, pastoralen Barden, der sich plötzlich in epischem Kampfgeschehen wiederfindet, das er sonst nur aus Liedern kennt (wenn überhaupt).[34] Im Kontrast zu Emathion nimmt er am Kampfgeschehen in keiner Weise teil.

33 Otis 1970: 346ff.: „a true parody of epic".

34 Für genre-spezifische Dichterfiguren, siehe Masters 1992: 6.

Bömer kommentiert, dass diese Szene eine lyrische Atmosphäre ausstrahlt und ihr die Geschmacklosigkeiten der parodistischen Übertreibungen abgehen.[35] Darüber hinaus bemerkt Bömer die ungewöhnliche Junktur von poetisch-griechischem Material mit traditionell Römischem im Vers *Stygiis cane cetera Manibus* (115f.) mit dem griechischen Wort *Styx* und dem lateinischen *Manes*. Mir scheint jedoch auch in dieser Passage Ovids Sinn für Humor durchzuscheinen: „Sing den Rest Deines Liedes den stygischen Schatten / mit stygischen (toten) Händen (cf. *digitis morientibus* 117)".[36]

Im Gegensatz zum Barden Ovid, der in den *Metamorphosen* (ab 1,451) wiederholt vom Epischen zum Elegischen wechselt, sieht sich Lampetides zu einem Genrewechsel – vom *Hymenaios*-Lied zum Epos – nicht in der Lage, was letztlich zu seinem Ende führt.[37] Dieses poetische Versagen findet seinen Ausdruck in Lampetides' *carmen miserabile*, seinem eigenen Totenlied – aber es ist gleichzeitig auch seine letzte Elegie, gespielt mit sterbenden Fingern in verklingenden Daktylen (mit oder in *digitis morientibus*). Im Tode kehrt er damit zurück zu seinem eigentlichen nichtepischen Genre. Lampetides' Finger, die noch im Tode musizieren, sind Bestandteil von Ovids Genreparodie eines epischen Kampfes. Dieser Automatismus, wenn auch diesmal nicht eines abgehackten Gliedes, ist zum einen als humorvolles Detail zu begreifen; zum anderen hilft er, die Implikationen der verschiedenen Genres, die Ovid parodiert, herauszustreichen. Ovids Automatismen des abgehackten Gliedes sind somit nicht nur grausame Zierde, sondern fester Bestandteil von Ovids metapoetischem Programm, eines Diskurses über die Macht des Wortes und über den Ruhm des Dichters.

4. Lucan

Lucan konfrontiert seine Leser in seinem Epos über den Bürgerkrieg mit Konflikten auf jeder nur denkbaren Ebene. Sein Werk involviert nicht nur seine Protagonisten in stetige Kämpfe und Gemetzel, sondern zeigt selbst das Wort im Widerstreit. Denn der Bürgerkrieg bildet sich sogar auf syntaktischer Ebene, unterstützt von mannigfaltigen rhetorischen Figuren, noch ab.[38] Lucan zeigt uns eine Welt im Chaos, eine Welt ohne Götter,

35 Siehe Bömer 1969-1986 *ad loc.*

36 Ich bin mir allerdings durchaus bewusst, dass *Manes* und *manus* unterschiedlich skandiert werden.

37 Ovid täuscht ähnliche Probleme zu Beginn der *Amores* (*am.* 1,1) vor. Wheeler 1999: Kapitel 1 weist auf die zweideutige Metrik der ersten Zeilen der *Metamorphosen* hin, die für einen Moment zwischen Elegie und Epos schweben.

38 Henderson 1998.

oder, um eine stoische Analogie zu benutzen, eine kopflose Welt. Hier zementiert die rhetorische Figur der Hypallage[39] – das heißt die Inversion der syntaktischen Beziehung zweier Worte (wie etwa im Ausdruck ‚das Gesicht ihrer Schönheit') – zusammen mit „a mass of personified weapons"[40] den Eindruck, dass weder Vernunft noch Menschenwillen die Soldatenkörper im Schlachtgeschehen kontrollieren. Dass diese beiden Stilfiguren extensiv mit Ausdrücken des Verwundens oder Verstümmelns gepaart werden, erweckt im Leser den Eindruck, dass sich das literarische *corpus* in syntaktischer Selbstverstümmelung übt.[41] Beispiele wie *percussum est pectore ferrum* (Lucan. 4,561) und *sed hinc iugulis, hinc ferro bella geruntur* (Lucan. 7,533) verdeutlichen, dass die „inversion of subject-object relations"[42] suizidale Körperteile produziert, die ihre eigenen Tode durch eine Art Proto-Automatismus herbeiführen. Die übliche Abfolge des Automatismus wird in den Schatten gestellt: Bei Lucan finden wir nicht einen wuchtigen Hieb, gefolgt von einem autarken Körperteil, sondern eine autarke Heldenbrust, die sich dem Schwert im Kampf entgegenstellt. Man fragt sich durchaus, ob wir hier nur ein weiteres Beispiel für das Chaos des Bürgerkrieges sehen sollten, eine auf den Kopf gestellte Welt, in der der Körper zur Waffe wird und die Waffe dem Körper ähnlich. Oder werden wir hier eher Zeugen von Lucans epischer Kriegsverweigerungshaltung, einer Dekonstruktion militärischen Heldentums im wirren Kampf der Kamikaze-Körperteile? Denn mit Sicherheit vergrößern diese Automatismen nicht den Ruhm der Kämpfenden. Das Fehlen eines Hauptheldens im *Bellum Civile* ist in der Forschung oft als Mangel empfunden worden.[43] Andererseits hat man in Ovids *Metamorphosen*, die ebenfalls keinen klar ersichtlichen Hauptheldens haben, den Dichter selbst zum Helden ausgerufen.[44] Ich möchte vorschlagen, dass die rhetorische Figur der Hypallage im *Bellum Civile* hilft, den Ruhm des Dichterheldens Lucan zu festigen, der erfolgreich seinen syntaktischen Kampf kämpft. Hier wird ein Konflikt mit Hilfe der Syntax verdeutlicht, um Lucans Poetik des totalen (Bürger-)Krieges zu verwirklichen.[45]

---

39 Zu Hypallage vgl. Feeney 1991: 251, v. Albrecht 1970: 270 und Most 1992: 397. Hübner 1972: 577 merkt an, dass Hypallage oftmals leb- und bewegungslose Gegenstände als lebend und beweglich darstellt.

40 Henderson 1998: 194.

41 Das Wort *corpus* wird in Ov. *trist.* 2,535 für eine Buchrolle benutzt; Most 1992: 407 verzahnt das menschliche mit dem literarischen *corpus*.

42 Bartsch 1997: 23.

43 Johnson 1987: 1.

44 Solodow 1988: 73.

45 Henderson 1998: 195 spricht von „crash of syntax with concept" und von „poetics of totalizing, civil, war."

5. Medusa

Elaine Fantham weist auf den Wechsel von Aktiv und Passiv in Lucans Medusa-Erzählung hin (Lucan. 9,619ff.).[46] Medusas lebendiges Schlangenhaar wird ihr am Ende zum Verhängnis (682). Allerdings wird eine aus ihrem Blute entsprungene Schlangenplage auf ewig an sie erinnern: ein beständiger Automatismus von Medusas ‚herrlichem' Haar.[47] Lucans Schlangenepisode bietet dann eine bemerkenswert detaillierte *Aristeia*, in welcher die Schlangen – und nicht etwa Medusa selbst – am Ende zu sechs toten Soldaten und einer Amputation führen. Der Leser wird sich erinnern, dass auch andere Haarlocken dazu gedient haben, den Ruhm ihrer ehemaligen Besitzer zu mehren.[48] Es scheint mir, als ob das in Berenices Locke (Catull. 66,42) nur latent vorhandene epische Element hier die Oberhand gewinnt. Lucan spielt durch, wie eine solche Locke in episches Kampfgeschehen passen könnte. Auch wenn wir in Lucans Epos anstelle himmlischer Konstellationen chthonische Reptilien vorfinden, dienen sie doch in gleicher Weise dazu, ihren ehemaligen Besitzer zu glorifizieren, wie es Berenices Locke tut. Perseus qualifiziert sich sicherlich nicht als Held dieser Passage, denn er wird als *trepidus* und *tremens* (675) beschrieben. Diese Episode dient vielmehr dazu, Medusas *fama* zu manifestieren.[49] In der Erzählgegenwart werden dann Medusas *comae* zu den *comites* von Cato und seinen Soldaten. Sie bringen Medusa und ihren Ruhm so in die Welt des Bürgerkieges. Medusa wird somit unerwarteter Weise zum Antagonisten der Römer. Lucans hellenistische Aitiologie vermittelt uns Lesern ein Zerrbild autarker enkomiastischer Haare, wie wir sie von Callimachus und Catull kennen.[50]

6. Marius Gratidianus

In ähnlicher Weise verarbeitet der *akroteriasmos* des Marius Gratidianus (Lucan. 2,181ff.) die literarische Tradition.[51] Conte weist insbesondere auf die ovidianische Zunge der Philomela hin, wie wir gesehen haben, eine Passage voll von Metapoetischem. Auch Marius' Zunge steht für mehr als nur die Betonung der Grausamkeit seiner Folterer. Wiederum begegnen wir dem Themenkomplex des Sprachverlustes und der

46 Fantham 1992: 100 und 104 *ad* 9,662.

47 Es gibt bereits einen ‚semi-Automatismus' in v. 672: *vigilat pars magna comarum.*

48 Kall. *fr.* 110 und Catull *c.* 66: *Coma Berenices.*

49 See Fantham 1992: 104 für Medusas posthume Siege.

50 Für Lucans Quellen vgl. Fantham 1992: 111ff.

51 Vgl. Conte 1968 *ad loc.* und Lebek 1976: 297-302.

Dehumanisierung. Marius war ein berühmter *orator* und wird als solcher in Ciceros *Brutus* 223 erwähnt. Hauptwerkzeuge des römischen Redners sind die Zunge wie auch die Hände, da in der Redekunst ausgeprägte Gestik angewandt wird.[52] Es darf daher nicht verwundern, dass die Verstümmelung gerade dieser beiden Körperteile in dieser Passage eine so prominente Rolle spielt. Die Verwendung des Marius als Blutopfer situiert seine Ermordung und Zerstückelung in einen animalischen Kontext; er wird mit Ritualschlachtungen in religiösem Bezugsrahmen assoziiert. Darüber hinaus streicht Lucan die Tatsache heraus, dass das Gesicht des Marius unkenntlich gemacht wird (190ff.): Keine Totenmaske wird stolz in Beerdigungsprozessionen mitgeführt werden und sein Andenken bewahren.[53] Weiter ruft das Bild seiner verunstalteten Leiche hier zum einen Priamus' enthaupteten Leichnam am Strande Trojas in Vergils *Aeneis* ins Gedächtnis und lässt zum anderen ebenfalls den Leichnam des Pompeius am Strande Ägyptens vorausahnen.[54] Überdies ist Marius Gratidianus in der Tat durch Adoption mit Cicero verwandt und könnte somit auch auf Ciceros Enthauptung hindeuten.[55] Sein Schicksal und seine Reputation leben so in Cicero weiter und bilden den Rahmen für eine Familientradition der (Selbst-)Aufopferung. Auch sollte man annehmen dürfen, dass die Zerstückelung des Marius die Selbstzerfleischung des römischen Staates im kommenden Bürgerkrieg vorwegnimmt. Lucan verbindet Marius mit Vergils Künstler Daedalus (*Aen.* 6,33) durch den Ausdruck *cecidere manus* (181). Allerdings platziert Lucan dieses intertextuelle Zitat in einen gewaltsameren Kontext – aber eher zynisch, wie man meinen könnte. Während Daedalus, vom Schmerz über den Absturz seines Sohnes übermannt, die Hände sinken lässt und somit seine künstlerische Vision nicht zu Ende führen kann, fallen Marius' Hände tatsächlich abgehackt zu Boden als Zeichen seiner Zerstörung, seines Untergangs und des Untergangs der römischen Republik selbst.[56]

52 Vgl. Quint. *inst.* 11,3,65-136; Cic. *orat.* 59; Graf 1991.

53 Durchweg wird im *Bellum Civile* die Wichtigkeit einer standesgemäßen Beerdigung betont, vgl. Lucan. 2,157ff.

54 Siehe Fantham 1992 *ad* 189.

55 Sall. *hist.* 1,44 (und *Bernensia ad loc.*) erwähnen Ciceros Erzfeind Catilina im Zusammenhang mit Marius' Ermordung. Man könnte überdies darüber spekulieren, ob Ciceros Tod im unvollendeten Teil des *Bellum Civile* geschildert worden wäre. Für eine Übersicht über die Theorien zur Struktur des Epos vgl. Schmitt 1989: 193-214 („Bibliographisches Nachwort").

56 Zu Daedalus vgl. Putnam 1998: 90ff.

7. Die Seeschlacht von Massilia

Die Seeschlacht von Massilia bietet dem Leser ein bluttriefendes Spektakel. Besonders bemerkenswert scheint mir hier die Verstümmelung eines namenlosen Zwillingsbruders (3,605), denn hier finden wir den Automatismus einer abgehackten Hand. Hunink hat den Einfluss dreier Traditionen auf diese Passage aufgezeigt: Das Zwillingsbruder-Motiv wird mit dem blutigen Kampfgeschehen des Epos verbunden und dazu noch mit dem *vir fortis sine manibus*-Topos, wie er in den Reden der Deklamationsschulen geübt wurde.[57] Im Gegensatz zu Vergil lässt Lucan einen der Zwillingsbrüder überleben, um als lebende Gedenkstatue seines toten Bruders zu dienen (608).[58] Metger hat bereits die Änderung des Verhältnisses der Zwillinge zu ihren Eltern bemerkt, in Vergil wird es von *gratus* geprägt, wohingegen es in Lucan durch den Bezug zur *gloria* charakterisiert wird.[59] Überdies zeigt Metger auf, dass die Geschichte eines verwundeten und alsbald auch verstümmelten Soldaten, der dennoch weiterkämpft, gewöhnlich von einem Schergen der caesarianischen Seite berichtet wird.[60]

Lucan dagegen wählt einen Helden aus Massilia, einer Stadt mit wohlbekannten griechischen Wurzeln.[61] Lucan verfremdet seinen Helden, deromanisiert ihn geradezu, um ihn so mit der Idee der *libertas* assoziieren zu können.[62] Damit folgt er dem Denkmuster, dass Heldentum in einem Bürgerkrieg zwischen Römern keinen Platz hat. Metger merkt an, dass Lucan sich im Gegensatz zu den Prosa-Versionen, die von dieser Episode berichten, auf das eigentliche Abhacken der Hand konzentriert. In den Prosaquellen dagegen ist dies nur einfach eine Voraussetzung für die darauffolgende einarmige *Aristeia* des Kämpfers.[63] Am Ende interpretiert

57 Vgl. Hunink 1992 *ad* 609.

58 Im Gegensatz zu Vergil und Ovid (*met.* 5,140), wo die unterschiedlichen Verletzungen dabei helfen, die Brüder zu unterscheiden, nimmt hier einer der Brüder zwei Identitäten an.

59 Metger 1970: 426.

60 Metger 1970: 427f.; Ehlert 1978 *ad loc.*, Hunink 1992: 609 listet weitere Quellen auf.

61 Gegründet ca. 600 v.Chr. als Kolonie von Phokaia; Arist. fr. 549 Rose = Athen. 13,576a tradieren die Gründungssage; vgl. ebenso Iust. 43,3,4-13, dessen Quelle Pomp. Trog. Lucan gekannt haben könnte.

62 Hunink 1970 *ad* 610 weist auf die Kontrastierung der Worte *Romanae* und *Graia* hin.

63 Metger 1970: 427 untersucht Val. Max. 3,2,22; Suet. *Iul.* 68 und Plut. *Caes.* 16. Allerdings lässt er Hdt. 6,114 aus (Aeschylus' Bruder Cynaegirus), eine Stelle, die Esposito 1987: 99 als „archetipo" bezeichnet.

Metger den Automatismus der Hand als „eine Art Selbstbehauptungswille, der bis zur Sinnlosigkeit gesteigert ist".[64]

Dem möchte ich nicht vorbehaltlos zustimmen: Hunink merkt an, dass die abgehackte Hand mit insistierender Versteifung selbst im Tode noch zupackt.[65] Lucan legt hier den Schwerpunkt seiner Beschreibung ganz eindeutig auf die Verstümmelung. In der Tat verliert der junge Held bald auch seinen anderen Arm. In der Forschung hat man die „analogy |...| between the body's destiny and that of societies and institutions" herausgestrichen.[66] Es gibt somit einen Zusammenhang zwischen der körperlichen Unversehrtheit des Individuums und der der Gesellschaft, in der es lebt.[67] Bartsch konstatiert: „The soldier's body is made to stand for the military corps itself".[68] Die lateinische ‚Körpersprache', d.h. die Worte, die im Lateinischen Körperteile beschreiben, können nicht nur zur Literaturkritik dienen, sondern ebenfalls eine Schlacht *en miniature* darstellen. *Manus* bezeichnet sowohl eine Hand als auch „an armed force (of any size)",[69] *ala* ist der Oberarm und gleichzeitig das Wort für „a wing or flank of an army",[70] *lacertus* für Oberarm und Truppenstärke.[71] Überdies hat Mary Beard auf die Tatsache hingewiesen, dass das Wort *armus* poetisch als Bezeichnung für den menschlichen Arm gebraucht wird, es aber auch (insbesondere im Dat./Abl. Plural) „an ambiguity (or intentional play) with the neuter plural „arma" (in the sense of „weapons")" gibt.[72] Lucan entwickelt diese Idee weiter – der Körper seines Helden wird zum Schutzschild für seinen Bruder und seine Kameraden. Ironischerweise wird einer, dem die Arme fehlen, nun als *arma tegens* (620) beschrieben. Zu guter Letzt gelingt es dem Soldaten gar, seinen verstümmelten Körper zu einer Waffe zu machen. Bereits als *emerita morte* (622) beschrieben, wird dem längst tot Gewähnten gar noch ein Nachleben vor dem Ableben zuteil.[73] Abschließend bleibt festzuhalten, dass die so auffallende Verstümmelung und die darauffolgende *Aristeia* eines Verstümmelten Lucans Anliegen

64 Metger 1970: 429.

65 Hunink 1992 *ad* 613.

66 Gilman 1975: 42 zitiert bei Bartsch 1997: 10.

67 Vgl. die Geschichte des Menenius Agrippa, Liv. 2,32,8ff.

68 Bartsch 1997: 11, ebenso 16 mit Bezug auf Lucan. 5,252 und 310 (Soldaten sind Caesars Hände; Armeen sein Körper); siehe auch Hardie 1993: 8 für das ‚einer für viele'-Prinzip in Bezug auf Caesars Körper und die Staatsorgane.

69 OLD *manus* 1 und 22.

70 OLD *ala* 2 und 5.

71 OLD *lacertus* 1 und 2 mit Beispielen aus dem Militär.

72 Beard 2002: n. 13 zu Verg. *Aen.* 4,11; 11,641 und 644. Vgl. OLD *armus* 2.

73 Vgl. Hunink 1992 *ad loc.* und Metger 1970: 436 *ad* 625 als „Mensch ohne Mensch-Sein".

verdeutlichen, unseren ‚nicht-römischen' Helden mit den bürgerkriegsgeplagten Römern zu kontrastieren.[74] Die Rebellion eines einzelnen Körperteiles gegen den Tod spiegelt somit die Reaktion des Verwundeten im Kleinformat wider. Überdies kann die ganze Passage ebenfalls im Lichte der Doppelbedeutungen der lateinischen Worte für Körperteile, Waffen und Militär als *mise en abyme* eines Kosmos der Gewalt gelesen werden, in dem der Körper des Zwillingsbruders zum Sinnbild des Bürgerkrieges avanciert.

8. Der Kopf des Pompeius

Abschließend bleibt noch ein letzter Automatismus als Diskussionsgegenstand, der sich in einer Schlüsselszene des *Bellum Civile* befindet, dem Mord und der Enthauptung des Pompeius (8,682f.). Dies wird von Hardie gleichgestellt „with the loss of Rome itself as " head of the world' *caput mundi* (9,123-125)".[75] In dieser Szene kommt Pompeius dem stoischen Ideal nahe und erreicht damit, dass er dank seines würdigen Ablebens das Epos als Held verlässt. Da Pompeius hier von einem römischen Soldaten, wenn auch im Dienste der Ägypter stehend, ermordet wird, ist sein Tod ein Abbild des Bürgerkrieges *en minature*: Ein Römer mordet einen Römer.[76] Pompeius ist noch in der Lage, seine Erniedrigung durch Achilles ‚zu sehen'. Dies trägt zusammen mit Lucans Detailreichtum und (Hyper-)Realismus zum Greuel dieser Szene bei.[77] Der Tod des Pompeius durch Enthauptung muss einem römischen Bürger, der im allgemeinen durch die *lex Porcia* vor Körperstrafen ohne Revisionsverfahren bewahrt war,[78] besonders scheußlich erschienen sein.[79] Dazu rahmen zwei weitere Enthauptungen den Bürgerkrieg ein, die des Crassus und die des Cicero.[80]

74 Ein beliebter rhetorischer Topos, vgl. Bonner 1966: 281.

75 Hardie 1993: 7; Bartsch 1997: 16 n. 13 zeigt die Omnipräsenz dieser Bildsprache auf. *Caput* = Bürger und Individuum; vgl. *philon kara* in der Tragödie; Verlust des Bürgerrechts: *demunitio capitis*, vgl. Richlin 1999: 193ff.; Fantham 1992: 110 arbeitet Parallelen zwischen den Köpfen des Pompeius und der Medusa heraus. Vgl. hierzu auch den Aufsatz von Lowe im vorliegenden Band.

76 Bartsch 1997: 24 n. 36 analysiert Pompeius' Tod als Suizid, er wird von einem römischen Soldaten getötet, einem der ‚Glieder' seines militärischen Corps.

77 Schnepf 1970: 384 für den Gebrauch von Realismus, um Horror hervorzurufen.

78 Rotondi 1962: 268; Mommsen 1887: 916.

79 Selinger 2001: 352 weist auf den Apostel Paulus hin (*Acta Apostolorum* 16,22-38).

80 Für Crassus vgl. Lucan. 1,99f. und 1,107f.; ebenso Plut. *Crass.*, 31-33; Für Cicero vgl. Liv. zitiert by Sen. *suas.* 7,14; Plut. *Cic.* 48-49 und ausführlich Richlin 1999.

Das Ende der Republik wird somit vom Verlust führender Köpfe geprägt, ein Zustand, der sich letztendlich auch auf den Staat im Allgemeinen überträgt. Pompeius büßt seine körperliche Integrität ein, versucht aber, innerlich unversehrt zu bleiben. Er wird seinem Beinamen gerecht und zeigt Größe, wenn er fällt.[81]

Automatismen abgehackter Körperteile relativieren die zeitliche Abfolge des Sterbens; sie leben fort, wenn der Rest des Körpers ablebt. Bei Pompeius steigert Lucan diesen Zustand ins Unendliche. Denn Lucan setzt sich über die Endlichkeit des Todes hinweg, wenn er dem Leser die Seele des Pompeius vorführt, wie sie über ihren nun kopflosen Rumpf lacht (9,14). Pompeius lebt in der Tat weiter; er läuft nicht Gefahr, vergessen zu werden, im Gegensatz zum enthaupteten Leichnam des Priamus, der namenlos am Ufer treibt. Lucan kann es wagen, *hic situs est Magnus* (8,793) zum weltweiten Slogan auszurufen (8,798f.), weil Pompeius ein Begräbnis verwehrt bleibt: Im römischen Reich werden Pompeius (und Lucan) unvergessen bleiben.[82]

9. Conclusio

Meine Untersuchung hat, wenn auch nur in kurzen Abrissen, die Entwicklung eines epischen Motivs nachgezeichnet, angefangen von Kurzauftritten als Einzeiler hin zu einer stetigen Expansion. Wir sind ebenfalls Zeugen geworden, wie unser Motiv stetig an Bedeutung zunimmt und sich als Träger der Metapoetik und historischen Anspielung etabliert. Das Motiv ist sich seiner Auffälligkeit bewusst und kann somit als bevorzugtes Medium dienen, um die Anliegen des Dichters zu kommunizieren. Es mehrt nicht (oder nicht nur) den Ruhm des Verstümmelnden, sondern auch den des Verstümmelten, sei es Medusa oder ein anonymer Soldat, und trägt so oft dazu bei, 'further voices' in das Epos einzuflechten. Schließlich garantiert es auch sein eigenes poetisches Nachleben, indem es sich fest in die epische Tradition einzementiert.[83]

81 Pompeius' Tod zeigt somit Parallelen zu den ‚schönen' Toden tragischer Figuren wie Iphigenie und Polyxena, vgl. Loraux 1987: 47; Vernant 1991: 60.

82 Henderson 1998: 202.

83 Vgl. Zwierlein 1970, Irving 1983, Gogol, Die Nase und den handgerechten Butler in den *Addams Family*-Filmen sowie einen Kurzauftritt im Film *Fluch der Karibik*.

Liste der Beitragenden – List of contributors

Frederick Ahl

is Professor of Classics and Comparative Literature at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
Email: fma2@cornell.edu

Annemarie Ambühl

ist als Postdoc mit der Afdeling Grieks en Latijn an der Rijksuniversiteit Groningen verbunden und habilitiert sich mit einer Arbeit zu Lucan.
Email: a.ambuehl@online.nl

Erica Bexley

is a graduate student of Classics at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
Email: emb268@cornell.edu

Martin Dinter

is Lecturer in Latin Literature and Language at King's College London.
Email: martin.dinter@kcl.ac.uk

Elaine Fantham

lehrte bis zu ihrer Emeritierung 1999 als Giger Professor of Latin an der Princeton University, USA.
Email: fantham@princeton.edu

Nicola Hömke

ist wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin für Lateinische Philologie am Heinrich Schliemann-Institut der Universität Rostock und habilitiert sich mit einer Arbeit zu Lucan.
Email: nicola.hoemke@uni-rostock.de

Dunstan Lowe

is lecturer in Classics at the University of Reading, UK.
Email: d.m.lowe@reading.ac.uk

Christiane Reitz

ist Professorin für Lateinische Philologie am Heinrich Schliemann-Institut der Universität Rostock.
Email: christiane.reitz@uni-rostock.de

Alessandro Rolim de Moura

is Assistant Professor of Classics at the Universidade Federal do Paraná, Brazil.
Email: alessandro.rolimdemoura@gmail.com

Lisa Sannicandro

wurde 2008 mit einer Arbeit über Lucan promoviert und arbeitet derzeit als Stipendiatin am Thesaurus Linguae Latinae in München.
Email: lisa.sannicandro@email.it

Claudia Wick

wurde 2004 mit einer Arbeit über Lucan promoviert und arbeitet als Redaktorin am Thesaurus Linguae Latinae in München.
Email: claudia.wick@thesaurus.badw.de

Claudia Wiener

ist Professorin für Lateinische Philologie an der LMU München.
Email: claudia.wiener@klassphil.uni-muenchen.de

Zusammenfassungen – Abstracts

FREDERICK AHL: Quintilian and Lucan

Quintilian (10.1.90) ranks Roman epic poets, in descending order, from most to least approved. He says Virgil is the best, but never tells us why – and even undercuts this assessment slightly by alluding to Domitius Afer's witticism that Virgil ranks closer to first than to third (10.1.86). Similarly, he notes: "we have lost much in Valerius," but adds no further explanation. He does not, however, mention Statius, whose Thebaid was in circulation as Quintilian wrote because it is his policy not to name writers still living. Following Virgil, and at a great distance, Quintilian insists, are Macer and Lucretius. Lucan occupies last place in the rankings: at the bottom of the list of epicists, albeit a short and very exclusive list. Yet Lucan's is not the last name on the list. It is followed, in a curious praeterition, by a name Quintilian says is the greatest of all in poetic potential, though it is precluded from formal ranking because its possessor has other cares and preoccupations: the Emperor Domitian. The only living person on the epic list is the poet manqué whose presence in Rome is the reason Quintilian cannot name living poets in his various lists. This essay suggests an explanation for why Quintilian juxtaposes Domitian to Lucan and places both names at the bottom of his ranked list of Roman epicists.

ANNEMARIE AMBÜHL: Lucan's 'Ilioupersis'

The old man's recollections of the civil war between Marius and Sulla at the beginning of the second book of Lucan's *Bellum civile* (67-233) have often been read as a counterpart to Aeneas' tale of the fall of Troy in the second book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. The present paper takes a fresh look at the nature and function of these correspondences in the light of the Ilioupersis tradition in various genres of Greek and Latin poetry, in order to study Lucan's transformation of his historical subject matter into an epic narrative. The accumulation of atrocities, mutilations and massacres in the old man's speech is first reviewed from the perspective of an aesthetics of violence in epic and tragedy and set into parallel to the themes of sacrilege, political murder and human sacrifice associated with

Priam, Astyanax and Polyxena in Euripides, Virgil and Seneca. Then, through a narratological analysis of first-person accounts and flashbacks, the narrative techniques employed in the speech are compared to tragic messenger-speeches and character *rheseis*, which also inspired Aeneas' 'autobiographical' version of the fall of Troy in *Aeneid* 2. Specifically, Lucan's anonymous old man is set into an intertextual relationship with the figure of the old queen Hecuba in Greek and Roman tragedy. It is shown how the older generation's recollections of past sufferings and their anxiety of the future gain psychological depth and poetic intensity through the evocation of the tragic subtexts.

LISA SANNICANDRO: *Ut generos .soceris mediae iunxere sabinae*: Die Gestalt Julias in der *Pharsalia* Lukans

Among the female characters in Lucan's *Pharsalia* Julia, Caesar's daughter and the fourth wife to Pompey, plays a minor but still very special part. Her death in 54 BC is the end of the family relationship and also of the political alliance between the two *duces*. For this reason Lucan mentions Julia's death as one of the *causae belli*. If Julia who had formed a unifying bond between Caesar and Pompey hadn't died prematurely, Rome wouldn't have been involved in civil war. The poet is convinced that Julia could have acted as ago between like the Sabine women who in Rome's early history prevented a conflict between their husbands and fathers and thus established unity. The *Pharsalia* thematize an impious war between relatives where Julia constituted the only guarantee for concord within the family. She was the only person involved who could eventually have prevented the irreversible process dissolving all family bonds.

ELAINE FANTHAM: Caesar's Voice and Caesarian Voices

The paper focusses on the situations in which Caesar is characterized by his speeches, the interlocutors with whom he makes contact, and the effects Lucan achieves by his selection of these contexts. The theoretical background can be found in the Panaetian theory of the four *personae*. This theory could serve as a tool for readers to determine the moral propriety of each individual's behaviour. Different behaviour is appropriate to different men, and it was Cato's *persona* which made it right for him to commit suicide rather than surrender to Caesar, whereas surrender was acceptable for others. Keeping this in mind can help us to understand apparent inconsistencies in Lucan's judgment of characters in the different

worlds of an army or the senate. So it will prove useful to examine who interacts with Caesar and how we should judge both their claims and their behaviour. It should be also kept in mind that Caesar's speeches often occur in a near vacuum, resulting in further action. When Caesar speaks, his audience do not reply, but obey. Lucan's Caesar only rarely comes into contact with his one class; he is most vivid in his direct dealings with his soldiers, and the exchanges between general and foot-soldiers offer the high points in the books leading up to his victory at Pharsalus. After the decisive battle, his rhetoric is silenced.

ALESSANDRO ROLIM DE MOURA: Lucan 7: Speeches at War

This chapter explores dialogical relationships between different speeches, and between speeches and narrator-text, in the *Bellum Civile*, especially book 7. The analysis identifies parallels linking discourses by different voices, and argues that the voices delivering these discourses respond to one another in a debate. This happens not just in dialogues between characters. In the way the narrator construes his interventions, or in the form he chooses to present the characters' speeches, one can notice his response to the actual or supposed words of his characters. When presenting a character's speech, the poet is inevitably engaged in a dialogue with the character, since the presentation of a speech is in itself a way of interpreting the speech, it is a rejoinder to this speech. Lucan's narrator interacts with the characters not only through his constant use of apostrophe, but also through comments that bear on what the heroes say. Also of interest is the way a given speech may function as an answer to another speech uttered in a completely different context, joining two or more characters that are not in actual face-to-face dialogue: a speech uttered by Caesar before a battle can be an answer to a speech by Pompey which is not physically heard by Caesar, but is presented in the poem in another scene. We shall also see how some of the characters' speeches contain replies to the narratorial text, as they at times re-elaborate, confirm or contradict ideas met with in the poet's discourse. The narrator can be seen as an addressee as far as he lays out the problems the characters are bound to discuss, discusses them himself, and, being so close to the characters as he is, allows them to provide their own answers to perplexities he is frequently unable to come to terms with.

NICOLA HÖMKE: Bit by Bit Towards Death – Lucan's Scaeva and the Aesthetisization of Dying

In 6.138-262 Lucan picks up his leitmotiv of the inversion of *ius* and *virtus* into *scelus* caused by the civil war by introducing the Caesarian centurion Scaeva. This figure is a true paradigm – but not for heroic *virtus*, as is intended by the epic *aristeia*, and for which he had been canonized before in numerous *exempla* collections. Rather, Lucan handels this tradition with a subtle poetological rejection: His Scaeva first explicitly points to his particular literary tradition as the protagonist of an epic *aristeia*, only to soon break with it and reveal it as a treacherous maneuver. In the end, not only the *aristeia* is unmasked as a deception to the reader, but also *virtus* has lost its justification as an absolute and relative value.

Instead, as I show in the second part of my paper, Lucan shapes the Scaeva figure into a representative of a concept that focuses on the aesthetisization of dying, for example through an artificial expansion of the interval between life and death. Choreographically arranged and developed in various instances throughout the epic, human dying is transformed from the result of heroic achievement to an aim and end in itself.

CLAUDIA WICK: *plus quam visibilia* – Lukans suggestive Nichtbeschreibungen

Lucan's epic is in some ways realistic: it presents the near-contemporary topic without the fabulous embellishment of the mythological epic. To give just one example, there is no Venus to provide her darling Caesar with arms and armor on the eve of the battle of Pharsalos. Yet the poem does not come across as 'prose versified', nor would anybody consider the way Lucan sets up the scenes as 'realistic'. This is largely owed to what has been called Lucan's rhetoric, which is the topic of an on-going debate. Scholars have commented on his pathos, important stylistic devices like paradox and hyperbole, and also on the lack of clarity of his descriptions. Still missing, however, is a synthesis in which these and other techniques are seen as expressions of one and the same creative will. This would undoubtedly yield important insights into Lucan's epic technique, which in its peculiarity has not yet received due attention.

Using examples taken mostly from book 9, I will look at the various techniques on which Lucan relies when by means of pathos and elements of the fantastic he adds depth to the historical events. His creative adaptation of motifs that belong to the mythological epic or to declamations serves the same purpose. While I have discussed most of the scenes in my commentary, I will now attempt a comprehensive interpretation.

DUNSTAN LOWE: Medusa, Antaeus, and *Caesar Libycus*

Although it is well known that Lucan's Libya is a wild and threatening place, its threat is not restricted to indigenous people, places and things, such as Hannibal, Cleopatra, the Syrtes, or the desert with its catalogue of horrifying snakes. He also associates Libya with anti-Republican Romans, above all Julius Caesar, who endangers the Republic with his excessive, animalistic energy and resembles the continent where he is trapped in the final book.

Although the gods as characters are removed from the world of the *Bellum Civile*, Lucan allows supernatural traces to linger in particular locations such as the Gallic grove in Book 3 or Thessaly in Book 6. Libya is by far the greatest of these reservoirs of frightening myth and fantasy, which do violence to the historical credibility of the narrative, just as Libya itself is presented as the origin or conduit of a number of historical characters who assault Italy and Europe.

Lucan's two mythic narratives (Antaeus in Book 4 and Medusa in Book 9) are essential parts of the hostile Libyan landscape, but in very different ways. The male Antaeus, associated with lions, is connected with a region of solid rock where he was destroyed. The female Medusa, associated with snakes, is connected with a region of shifting sands where she left a deadly, everlasting legacy. To complicate matters further, even though Medusa's snakes represent the annihilation of the Republican self, the logic of the narrative is undermined and there is even a sympathetic subtext. As part of Libya's historical and mythical legacy, these stories reveal that for Lucan, historical epic is linked with Republicanism, but mythical epic is in the service of dictatorship.

ERICA BEXLEY: The Myth of the Republic: Medusa and Cato in Lucan, *Pharsalia* 9

This paper analyzes Lucan's Perseus and Medusa excursus and its relation Cato's battle with Libyan serpents. Decapitated, Medusa symbolizes the doomed republican cause and the disintegrating body of traditional Roman government. Yet Lucan also transforms Medusa's stony gaze into a positive force and stresses that Cato's role as a witness helps his soldiers endure their pain. Like the testis that appears in Seneca's letters, Lucan's Cato silently advocates personal detachment and *constantia* as the only methods for escaping suffering. This paper also examines the contrasting political and philosophical ideas embodied by Lucan's Cato. The prevalence of Senecan motifs in Lucan's portrait of Cato suggests that Lucan espoused a fairly Senecan notion of *libertas* while his participation in the

Pisonian conspiracy precludes outright republicanism. Lucan's Cato embodies and articulates many of the political difficulties Lucan faced.

CLAUDIA WIENER: Stoische Erneuerung der epischen Tradition – Der Bürgerkrieg als Schicksal und die Entscheidungsfreiheit zum Verbrechen

The conspicuous formal innovations Lucan puts into motion against the Roman epic tradition include the "Götterapparat" and the mass scenes. These can be explained by taking the stoic background of the epic into consideration. Roman Stoa lends the frame to the teleological aim of the poem. This does not mean that Lucan's creation is less fascinating, on the contrary. Comparison with contemporary Latin literature shows that the stoic interpretation of history psychology do not lead to a simplification, but make Lucan's complex analysis of the civil war possible in the first place. It is the natural law of coming into being and disappearing, of decline and fall which gives the series of events its sense. The cosmic dimension on the one side and the situation of the individual on the other side build up a tension: the individual cannot understand and cannot escape the complex situation. In the midth of catastrophe man is forced to act. Thereby his moral integrity, the only form of autarkeia which the stoa bestowes on mankind, is threatened to the extreme.

MARTIN DINTER: ...und es bewegt sich doch! Der Automatismus des abgehackten Gliedes

My concern in this paper will be to improve the reputation of cut off body parts by examining severed limbs in Latin epic. Latin epicists confront their readership with more and more detailed descriptions of violence, injuries and wounds. In a statistical survey Glenn Most has pointed to the 'overwhelming preference among all epic poets for puncture wounds'. More serious injuries, i.e. amputations, are on the rise in post-Virgilian epic and Lucan in particular offers detailed depictions of them. I will undertake to demonstrate that these are not merely expressions of the author's bad taste or fascination with cruelty. In addition their hyperbolic nature does not simply serve to stress the unreality of what happens as Fuhrmann suggests. By concentrating on the epic motif of the automated body part, severed limbs that keep twitching and cut off tongues that keep murmuring, I show that epic automatisms meet the demands of fine spun poetry and embody an author's poetics. By tracing the development of this motif from its humble beginnings in one line appearances in Ennius, via Lucretius, Virgil and Ovid to taking centre stage in Lucan's *Bellum*

Civile I will demonstrate that these scenes are not just virtuoso etudes for bloodshed's sake but thanks to their prominence become a preferred place for communicating an author's concerns.

Literaturverzeichnis – Bibliography

Adams, James Noel (1982). *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary.* London.

Ahl, Frederick (1972). 'Hercules and Curio: Some Comments on Pharsalia, IV, 581-824', *Latomus* 31: 997-1009.

Ahl, Frederick (1976). *Lucan: An Introduction.* Ithaca and London.

Ahl, Frederick (1993). 'Form empowered: Lucan's Pharsalia', in Anthony James Boyle (ed.), *Roman Epic*, London/New York. 125-142.

Ahl, Frederick (1984a). 'The Art of Safe Criticism in Greece and Rome, *AJP* 105: 174-208.

Ahl, Frederick (1984b). 'The Rider and the Horse: Politics and Power in Roman Poetry from Horace to Statius', *ANRW* 32.1: 40-110.

Albertus, Josef (1908). *Die [illegible] in der griechischen und römischen Literatur.* Diss. Kaiser-Wilhems-Universität Strassburg.

Albrecht, Michael von (1970). 'Der Dichter Lucan und die epische Tradition', in Durry, M. (ed.), *Lucain, Sept exposés suivis de discussions (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XV).* Vandœuvres-Genève. 269-301.

Ambühl, Annemarie (2005). 'Thebanos imitata rogos (*BC* 1,552): Lucans *Bellum Civile* und die Tragödien aus dem thebanischen Sagenkreis', in Walde 2005: 261-294.

Ambühl, Annemarie (forthcoming). *Krieg und Bürgerkrieg bei Lucan und in der griechischen Literatur. Studien zur Rezeption der attischen Tragödie und der hellenistischen Dichtung im Bellum civile.* Berlin u.a.

Ambühl, Annemarie (forthcoming). 'Trojan Palimpsests: The Relation of Greek Tragedy to the Homeric Epics', in Philip S. Alexander, Armin Lange and Renate Pillinger (ed.), *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature.* Leiden.

Anderson, Michael J. (1997). *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art.* Oxford.

Anderson, William S. (1989). 'The artists' limits in Ovid. Orpheus, Pygmalion and Daedalus', *Syllecta Classica* 1: 1-11.

Anzinger, Silke (2007). *Schweigen im römischen Epos. Zur Dramaturgie der Kommunikation bei Vergil, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus und Statius.* Berlin/New York.

Armisen-Marchetti, Mireille (1986). 'Imagination et méditation chez Sénèque. L'example de la praemeditatio', *REL* 64: 185-195.

Ash, Rhiannon (1999). *Ordering Anarchy: Armies and Leaders in Tacitus' Histories.* London.

Aumont, Jacques (1968). 'Caton en Libye (Lucain, *Pharsale*, IX.294-949)', *REA* 70: 304-320.

Aumont, Jacques (1968). 'Sur l'épisode des reptiles dans la *Pharsale* de Lucain (IX, 587-937)', *BAGB*: 103-119.

Aymard, Jacques (1951). *Quelques séries de comparaisons chez Lucain.* Montpellier.

Badalì, Renatus (1992) (ed.). *Lucani opera.* Roma.

Bakhtin, Michail Michajlovie (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. by M. Holquist, trans. by C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin.

Barchiesi, Alessandro (1988). *Seneca, Le Fenicie*, traduzione e commento a cura di A. B. Venezia.

Barchiesi, Alessandro (2001). *Voices and Narrative "Instances" in the Metamorphoses*, in id. *Speaking Volumes.* London.

Barrett, James (2002). *Staged Narrative: Poetics and the Messenger in Greek Tragedy.* Berkeley etc.

Bartsch, Shadi (1997). *Ideology In Cold Blood: A Reading of Lucan's Civil War.* Cambridge, Mass. and London.

Bartsch, Shadi (2005). 'Lucan', in John Miles Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic.* Malden, Mass./Oxford. 492-502.

Bartsch, Shadi (2006). *The Mirror of the Self: Sexuality, Self-Knowledge and the Gaze in the Early Roman Empire.* Chicago.

Bastet, Frédéric Luis (1970). 'Lucain et les arts', in Durry, M. (ed.), *Lucain, Sept exposés suivis de discussions (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XV)*. Vandœuvres-Genève. 119-158.

Batinski, Emily Elisabeth (1992). 'Cato and the Battle with the Serpents', *SyllClass* 3: 71-80.

Beard, Mary (2002). 'Did Romans have elbows? or Arms and the Romans', in Philippe Moreau (ed.), *Corps Romains*. Grenoble. 47-60.

Berno, Francesca Romana (2004). 'Un truncus, molti re. Priamo, Agamemnone, Pompeo (Virgilio, Seneca, Lucano)', *Maia* 56: 79-84.

Berti, Emanuele (2000). *M. Annaei Lucani Bellum Ciuile, Liber X*. Firenze.

Billerbeck, Margarethe (1986). 'Stoizismus in der römischen Epik neronischer und flavischer Zeit'. *ANRW* II 32.5. Berlin / New York. 3116-3151.

Blänsdorf, Jürgen (ed.) (1995). *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum epicorum et lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium. Post W. Morel et K. Büchner ed. J.B., ed. 3 aucta*. Stuttgart / Leipzig.

Bleisch, Pamela (1999). 'The Empty Tomb at Rhoeteum: Deiphobus and the Problem of the Past in Aeneid 6.494-547', *ClAnt* 18: 187-226.

Bobzien, Susanne (1998). *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*. Oxford.

Bobzien, Susanne (1999). 'Chrysippus' Theory of Causes', in Katerina Ierodiakonou (ed.), *Topics in Stoic philosophy*. Oxford. 196-242.

Bömer, Franz (1969-86). *P. Ovidius Naso. Kommentar*. 6 Bde, Erg. Bd. 2008. Heidelberg.

Bonner, Stanley Frederick (1966). 'Lucan and the Declamation Schools', *AJPh* 87: 257-289.

Bourgéry, Abel (1928). 'Lucain et la Magie', *REL* 6: 299-313.

Boyle, Anthony James (ed.) (1993). *Roman Epic*. London / New York.

Bramble, John C. (1967). 'Lucan's Hexameter and Text', in Ollfors 1967: 179-182.

Braund, Susan H. (1992). *Lucan: Civil War. A new translation.* Oxford.

Bremmer, Jan N. (2007). 'Myth and Ritual in Greek Human Sacrifice: Lykaon, Polyxena and the Case of the Rhodian Criminal', in id. (ed.), *The Strange World of Human Sacrifice.* Leuven etc. 55-79.

Brena, Fabrizio (1993). 'Das Blut und die Flamme: Anmerkung zu Lucan 2,126-129', *RhM* 136: 307-321.

Brenk, Frederick E. (1999). 'Violence as structure in Ovid's Metamorphoses', in id. *Clothed in Purple Light.* Stuttgart. 184-196.

Brisset, Jacqueline (1964). *Les idées politiques de Lucain.* Paris.

Broughton, Thomas R.S. (1951). *Magistrates of the Roman Republic.* Vol. 1 and 2. Chico, CA.

Broughton, Thomas R.S. (1986). *Magistrates of the Roman Republic,* Vol. 3. Chico, CA.

Brown, Robert (1995). 'Livy's Sabine Women and the Ideal of Concordia', *TAPA* 125: 171-181.

Bruère, Richard Treat (1950). 'The Scope of Lucan's Historical Epic', *CPh* 45: 217-231.

Bruère, Richard Treat (1951). 'Lucan's Cornelia', *CPh* 46: 221-236.

Bruère, Richard Treat and **Thompson, Lynette** (1970). 'The Virgilian Background to Lucan's Fourth Book', *CPh* 65: 152-72.

Burkert, Walter (1985). *Greek Religion.* Cambridge, Mass.

Burkert, Walter (1998). *Kulte des Altertums. Biologische Grundlagen der Religion.* München.

Caillois, Roger (1965). *Au coeur du fantastique.* Paris.

Campen, Ferdinandus Honoreus Maria van (1991). *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili liber II: Een commentaar.* Diss. Nijmegen. Amsterdam.

Casamento, Alfredo (2005). *La parola e la guerra: Rappresentazioni letterarie del Bellum Civile in Lucano.* Bologna.

Catin, Léon (1944). *En lisant Tite-Live.* Paris.

Cazzaniga, Ignazio (1956). 'Osservazioni a Lucano 1° IX 828-33: L'avventura di Murro col basilisco', *Acme* 9: 7-9.

Cazzaniga, Ignazio (1957). 'L'episodio dei serpi libici in Lucano e la tradizione dei Theriaka Nicandrei', *Acme* 10: 27-41.

Cizek, Eugen (1982). *Néron.* Paris.

Clark, Gillian (1998). 'Bodies and Blood. Late Antique debate on martyrdom, virginity and resurrection', in Montserrat, D. (ed.), *Changing Bodies, Changing Meanings.* London. 99-115.

Clauss, James J. (1989). 'The episode of Lycian farmers in Ovid's Metamorphoses', *HSCP* 92: 297-314.

Coleman, Kathleen M. (1990). 'Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments', *JRS* 80: 44-73.

Connors, Catherine (1998). *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon.* Cambridge.

Conte, Gian Biagio (1968). 'La guerra civile nella rievocazione del popolo: Lucano, II 67-233. Stile e forma della Pharsalia', *Maia* 20: 224-253.

Conte, Gian Biagio (1970). 'Ennio e Lucano', *Maia* 22: 123-138, repr. in id. (1988), *La 'Guerra Civile' di Lucano.* Urbino.

Conte, Gian Biagio (1974). *Saggio di commento a Lucano. Pharsalia VI 118-260: L'Aristia di Sceva.* Pisa.

Courtney, Edward (ed.) (2003). *The Fragmentary Latin Poets. With commentary*, rev. ed. Oxford.

Croally, Neil T. (1994). *Euripidean Polemic: The Trojan Women and the Function of Tragedy.* Cambridge.

D'Alessandro Behr, Francesca (2005). 'The Narrator's Voice: a Narratological Reappraisal of Apostrophe in Virgil's Aeneid', *Arethusa* 38: 189-221.

D'Alessandro Behr, Francesca (2007). *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion.* Columbus.

de Jong, Irene J.F. (1987). 'The Voice of Anonymity: τις-Speeches in the Iliad', *Eranos* 85: 69-84.

de Jong, Irene J.F. (1991). *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech.* Leiden etc.

de Jong, Irene, Nünlist, René, and **Bowie, Angus** (ed.) (2004). *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, 1. Leiden / Boston.

Derematz, Alain (2000). 'Le livre II de l'Énéide et la conception virgilienne de l'épopée: Épopée et tragedie dans l'Énéide', *REL* 78: 76-92.

Dewar, Michael (1988). 'Turning the Tables: Varius, Virgil and Lucan', *CQ* 38: 561-562.

Di Benedetto, V. (1994). *Nel laboratorio di Omero.* Torino.

Diggle, James (ed.) (1981). *Euripidis Fabulae Tomus II.* Oxford.

Diggle, James (ed.) (1984). *Euripidis Fabulae Tomus I.* Oxford.

Dilke, Oswald Ashton Wentworth (1960, repr. 1978). *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Ciuili Liber VII, revision of J. P. Postgate's edn.* Cambridge.

Dinter, Martin T. (2005). 'Lucan's Epic Body', in Walde 2005: 295-312.

Dinter, Martin T. (2006). *Lucan's Epic Body: Corporeality in the Bellum Civile.* Diss. Cambridge.

Dreyling, Henning (1999). *Lucan, Bellum civile II 1-525: Ein Kommentar.* Diss. Köln.

Due, Otto Steen (1962). 'An Essay on Lucan'. *C&M* 23: 68-132.

Due, Otto Steen (1970). 'Lucain et la philosophie', in Durry, M. (ed.), *Lucain, Sept exposés suivis de discussions (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XV).* Vandœuvres-Genève. 1968. 201-232.

Duff, John (tr.) (1962). *Lucan, The Civil War I-X.* Cambridge, MA / London.

Effe, Bernd (2004). *Epische Objektivität und subjektives Erzählen: ‚Auktoriale' Narrativik von Homer bis zum römischen Epos der Flavierzeit.* Trier.

Ehlers, Wilhelm (ed., tr.) (1978). *Lucanus, Bellum Civile. Der Bürgerkrieg. 2. Aufl.* München.

Eldred, Katherine O. (2000). 'Poetry In Motion: The Snakes Of Lucan', *Helios* 27: 63-74.

Erskine, Andrew (2001). *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power*. Oxford.

Esposito, Paolo (1987). *Il racconto della strage. Le battaglie nella Pharsalia*. Napoli.

Esposito, Paolo (1995). 'Lucano e Ovidio', in Gallo, Italo / Nicastri, Luciano (ed.), *Aetates Ovidianae*. Lettori di Ovidio dall'Antichità al Rinascimento. Napoli. 57-76.

Esposito, Paolo (1999). 'Alcune priorità della critica lucanea', in Esposito e Nicastri 1999: 11-37.

Esposito, Paolo e Nicastri, Luciano (ed.) (1999). Interpretare Lucano. Miscellanea di Studi. Neapoli.

Esposito, Paolo (2001). 'Paradosso ed esemplarità nell' episodio di Vulteio (B.C. IV 402-581)', *Vichiana ser.* 4,3: 39-63.

Fabre-Serris, Jacqueline (1998). *Mythologie et littérature à Rome: La réécriture des mythes aux I^er^s siècles avant et après J.-C.* Lausanne.

Fantham, Elaine (ed.) (1982). *Seneca's Troades. A literary introduction with text, translation and commentary*. Princeton.

Fantham, Elaine (1985). 'Caesar and the Mutiny. Lucan's reshaping of the historical tradition in De bello civili 5.237-373', *CPh* 80: 119-31.

Fantham, Elaine (ed.) (1992). *Lucan: De Bello Civili II*. Cambridge.

Fantham, Elaine (1992). 'Lucan's Medusa-Excursus: Its Design and Purpose', *MD* 29: 95-119.

Fantham, Elaine (1995). 'The ambiguity of Virtus in Lucan's Civil War and Statius' Thebaid', *Arachnion* 1.3: http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num3/fantham.html

Fantham, Elaine (1996). 'Religio... dira loci: two passages in Lucan de Bello Civili 3 and their relation to Vergil's Rome and Latium', *MD* 37: 137-153.

Fantham, Elaine (1999). 'Lucan and the Republican Senate: Ideology, Historical Record and Prosopography', in Esposito, P. and Nicastri, L. (ed.), *Interpretare Lucano*. Napoli. 109-25.

Faust, Rudolf (1908). *De Lucani Orationibus, Pars I, Pharsaliae Librorum I. II. III. Orationes Continens.* Diss. Königsberg.

Feeney, Denis C. (1983). 'The Taciturnity of Aeneas', *CQ* 33: 204-19.

Feeney, Denis C. (1986). ' "Stat Magni Nominis Vmbra." Lucan on the Greatness of Pompeius Magnus', *CQ* 36: 239-243.

Feeney, Denis C. (1991). *The Gods in Epic.* Oxford.

Feldherr, Andrew (1998). *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History.* Berkeley.

Fernandelli, Marco (1999). 'Sic pater Aeneas... fata renarrabat divom: Esperienza del racconto e esperienza nel racconto in Eneide II e III', *MD* 42: 95-112.

Ferrari, Gloria (2000). 'The Ilioupersis in Athens', *HSCPh* 100: 119-150.

Finiello, Concetta (2005). 'Der Bürgerkrieg: Reine Männersache? Keine Männersache! Erictho und die Frauengestalten im Bellum Civile Lucans', in Walde 2005: 155-185.

Finley, Moses I. (1964). *The world of Odysseus.* rev. ed. London.

Fischer, Günther, and Moraw, Susanne (ed.) (2005). *Die andere Seite der Klassik: Gewalt im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Kulturwissenschaftliches Kolloquium Bonn, Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 11.-13. Juli 2002.* Stuttgart.

Foucault, Michel (1979). *Discipline and Punish, the birth of the prison.* trl. by A. Sheridan. repr. London.

Franchet d'Espèrey, Sylvie (2004). 'Massacre et aristie dans l'épopée latine', in Gérard Nauroy (ed.), *L'écriture du massacre en littérature entre histoire et mythe. Des mondes antiques à l'aube du XXIe siècle.* Bern/Frankfurt am Main. 27-43.

Fränkel, Hermann (1968). *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios.* München.

Friedrich, Wolf-Hartmut (1938). 'Cato, Caesar und Fortuna bei Lucan', *Hermes* 73: 391-423.

Friedrich, Wolf-Hartmut (1948). 'Ennius-Erklärungen', *Phil* 97: 277-301.

Fuhrmann, Manfred (1968). 'Die Funktion grausiger und ekelhafter Motive in der lateinischen Dichtung', in H.R. Jauss (Hg.), *Die nicht mehr schönen Künste: Grenzphänomene des Ästhetischen. Poetik und Hermeneutik 3.* München. 23-66.

Gagliardi, Donato (1975). *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Ciuilis Liber VII.* Firenze.

Gall, Dorothee (2005). 'Masse, Heere und Feldherren in Lucans Pharsalia', in Walde 2005: 89-110.

Gaßner, Jakob (1972). *Kataloge im römischen Epos. Vergil-Ovid-Lucan. Diss.* München.

Gelzer, Matthias (1968). *Caesar: Politician and Statesman.* tr. R. Needham. Oxford.

Genette, Gérard (1972). *Figures III.* Paris.

Genette, Gérard (1983). *Nouveau discours du récit.* Paris.

Genette, Gérard (2004). *Métalepse.* Paris.

George, David B. (1991). 'Lucan's Cato and Stoic Attitudes to the Republic', *ClAnt* 10: 237-258.

Getty, Robert J. (ed.) (1940). *M. Annaei Lucani: De bello civili, liber 1.* Cambridge.

Gilman, Richard (1975). *Decadence: The Strange Life of an Epithet.* New York.

Glaesser, Roland (1984). *Verbrechen und Verblendung. Untersuchungen zum Furor-Begriff bei Lucan mit Berücksichtigung der Tragödien Senecas.* Frankfurt am Main.

Goebel, George H. (1981). 'Rhetorical and Poetical Thinking in Lucan's Harangues (7.250-382)', *TAPA* 111: 79-94.

Gorman, Vanessa B. (2001). 'Lucan's Epic Aristeia and the Hero of the Bellum Civile', *CJ* 96: 263-290.

Gowing, Alain M. (2005). *Empire And Memory: the representation of the Roman Republic in imperial culture.* Cambridge.

Graf, Fritz (1991). 'Gestures and conventions: the gestures of Roman actors and orators' in Bremmer, J. and Roodenburg, H. (ed.), *A cultural History of Gesture.* Cambridge. 36-58.

Griffin, Miriam T. (1984). *Nero: The End of a Dynasty.* London.

Griffin, Miriam T. (2009). *Blackwell's Companion to Julius Caesar.* Oxford.

Griffiths, John Gwyn (1980). *The origins of Osiris and his cult. Studies in the history of religions, Numen* suppl 40. Leiden.

Grimal, Pierre (1949). 'L'Épisode d'Antée dans la *Pharsale*', *Latomus* 8: 55-61.

Guastella, Giovanni (1985). 'La rete del sangue: simbologia delle relazioni e modelli dell'identità nella cultura romana', *MD* 15: 49-123.

Haley, Shelley P. (1985). 'The Five Wives of Pompey the Great', *G&R* 32: 49-59.

Hansen, Mogens Herman (1993). 'The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography. Fact or Fiction?', *Historia* 42: 161-180.

Hansen, Mogens Herman (1998). 'The Little Grey Horse – Henry V's Speech at Agincourt and the Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography', *Histos* 2: http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/1998/hansen.html.

Harder, Annette (2007). 'Epigram and the Heritage of Epic', in Peter Bing and John Steffen Bruss (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram: Down to Philip.* Leiden/Boston. 409-428.

Hardie, Philip Russel (1990). 'Ovid's Theban History: The First Anti-Aeneid?', *CQ* 40: 224-235.

Hardie, Philip Russel (1993). *The Epic Successors of Virgil.* Cambridge.

Hardie, Philip Russel (1995). 'The Speech of Pythagoras in Ovid Metamorphoses 15: Empedoclean Epos', *CQ* 45: 103-121.

Hardie, Philip Russel (2002). 'Ovid and Early Imperial Literature' in id. (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Ovid.* Cambridge.

Hardie, Philip Russel (2008). 'Lucan's Song of the Earth', in Ettore Cingano and Lucio Milano (ed.), *Papers on Ancient Literatures: Greece, Rome and the Near East. Proceedings of the "Advanced Seminar in Humanities" (Venice International University 2004-2005).* Padova. 305-330.

Harich, Henriette (1990). 'Catonis Marcia. Stoisches Kolorit eines Frauenportraits bei Lucan (II 326-350)', *Gymnasium* 97: 212-223.

Harries, Byron (1990). 'The spinner and the poet: Arachne in Ovid's Metamorphoses', *PCPhS* 36: 64-82.

Harrison, Stephen J. (ed.) (1991). *Vergil, Aeneid 10.* Ed. with indrod., transl. and comm. Oxford.

Harrison, Stephen J. (2007). *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace.* Oxford.

Haskins, Charles Edmund (ed.) (1887). *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia.* Cambridge.

Haubold, Johannes (2000). *Homer's People.* Cambridge.

Heinze, Richard (1915). *Vergils epische Technik.* Berlin.

Helzle, Martin (1996). *Der Stil ist der Mensch: Redner und Reden im römischen Epos.* Stuttgart/Leipzig.

Henderson, John (1987). 'Lucan/The Word at War', *Ramus* 16: 122-164. Revised as (1998). 'Lucan/The Word at War', in id. (1998) Fighting For Rome. Cambridge. 165-211.

Henrichs, Albert (2000). 'Drama and Dromena: Bloodshed, Violence, and Sacrificial Metaphor in Euripides', *HSCPh* 100: 173-188.

Henrichs, Albert (2006). 'Blutvergießen am Altar: Zur Ritualisierung der Gewalt im griechischen Opferkult', in Bernd Seidensticker and Martin Vöhler 2006: 59-87.

Highet, Gilbert (1972). *The Speeches in Vergil's Aeneid.* Princeton.

Hijmans, Benjamin Lodwijk (1959). ΑΣΚΗΣΙΣ . *Notes on Epictetus' Educational System.* Diss. Utrecht.

Hill, Donald E. (ed.) (2000). *Ovid: Metamorphoses XIII-XV. With an introduction, translation and notes.* Warminster.

Hinds, Stephen (1987). *The Metamorphosis of Persephone.* Cambridge.

Hömke, Nicola (1998). 'Ordnung im Chaos. Macht und Ohnmacht in Lucans Erichtho-Episode', in Manuel Baumbach, Helga Köhler, Adolf Martin Ritter (ed.), *Mousopolos Stephanos. Festschrift für Herwig Görgemanns.* Heidelberg. 119-137.

Hömke, Nicola (2006). 'Die Entgrenzung des Schreckens: Lucans Erictho-Episode aus Sicht moderner Phantastik-Konzeptionen', in ead., Manuel Baumbach (eg.): *Fremde Wirklichkeiten. Literarische Phantastik und antike Literatur*. Heidelberg. 161-185.

Hopkins, Keith (1983). *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge.

Hornblower, Simon (1987). *Thucydides*. London.

Housman, Alfred E. (ed.) (1927). *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libri decem*. Oxford.

Hübner, Ulrich (1972), 'Hypallage in Lucans Pharsalia', *Hermes* 100: 577-600.

Hübner, Ulrich (1975). 'Studien zur Pointentechnik in Lucans Pharsalia', *Hermes* 103: 200-211.

Hübner, Ulrich (1984). 'Episches und Elegisches am Anfang des dritten Buches der Pharsalia', *Hermes* 112: 227-239.

Hunink, Vincent Jan Christiaan (1992). *M. Annaeus Lucanus Bellum Civile Book III. A Commentary*. Amsterdam.

Hurschmann, Rolf (1998), Artikel 'Haartracht', in *Der Neue Pauly*, 5. 39-45.

Hutchinson, Gregory O. (1993). *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: a Critical Study*. Oxford.

Irving, Washington (1983). 'The Legend of Sleepy Hollow', in id., *History, Tales and Sketches*. Cambridge. 1058-89.

Jal, Paul (1961). 'Remarques sur la cruauté à Rome pendant les guerres civiles (de Sylla à Vespasien)', *BAGB* 4.1: 475-501.

Jal, Paul (1963). *La guerre civile a Rome. Étude littéraire et morale*. Paris.

Johnson, Walter Ralph (1987). *Momentary Monsters: Lucan And His Heroes*. Ithaca and London.

Joplin, Patricia Klindienst (1991). 'The voice of the shuttle is ours', repr. in L.A. Higgins and B.R. Silver (ed.), *Rape and Representation*. New York. 141-159.

Kaufhold, Shelley D. (1997). 'Ovid's Tereus: fire, birds and the reification of figurative language', *CP* 92: 66-71.

Keith, Alison M. (1999). 'Versions of epic masculinity in Ovid's Metamorphoses', in Hardie et al. (ed.), *Ovidian transformations*. Cambridge. 214-239.

Keith, Alison M. (2000). *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge.

King, Helen (1998). *Hippocrates' Woman. Reading the Female Body in Ancient Greece*. London.

Klingner, Friedrich (1956). 'Catulls Peleus-Epos', *SBAW* 6. München.

Klotz, Alfred (ed.) (1950-52). *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii: de bello civili libri tres*. Stuttgart.

Knox, Peter E. (1986). *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.

Kötting, Bernhard (1986). Artikel 'Haar', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum (RAC)* 13. 177-203.

Kowalewski, Barbara (2002). *Frauengestalten im Geschichtswerk des T. Livius*. München/Leipzig.

Kühlmann, Wilhelm (1973). *Katalog und Erzählung: Studien zu Konstanz und Wandel einer literarischen Form in der antiken Epik*. Diss. Freiburg.

Kytzler, Bernhard (1968). 'Der Bittgang der argivischen Frauen (Statius, Thebais 10, 49-83)', *AU* 11.1: 50-61.

Labate, Mario (1991). 'Città morte, città future: Un tema della poesia augustea', *Maia* 43: 167-184.

La Follette, Laetitia (1994). 'The costume of the Roman Bride', in Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante (ed.), *The World of Roman Costume*. Madison, Wisc. 54-64.

Laird, Andrew (1999). *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature*. Oxford.

Landolfi, Luciano (2007). 'Stratigrafie multiple e suggestioni dotte: L'esempio di Luc. Phars. 9, 700-733.' In Luciano Landolfi and Paolo Monella (ed.), *Doctus Lucanus: Aspetti dell'erudizione nella Pharsalia di Lucano*. Bologna. 111-49.

Lang, Mabel L. (1984). *Herodotean Narrative and Discourse*. Cambridge, Mass. and London.

La Penna, Antonio (1994). '*Me, me, adsum qui feci, in me convertite ferrum...!* Per la storia di una scena tipica dell'epos e della tragedia', *Maia* 46: 123-134.

Larmour, David H.J. (1990). 'Tragic contaminatio in Ovid's Metamorphoses: Procne and Medea, Philomela and Iphigeneia (6.424-674), Scylla and Phaedra (8.19-151)', *ICS* 15: 131-141.

Lausberg, Marion (1985). 'Lucan und Homer', *ANRW* II.32.3: 1565-1622.

Lateiner, Donald (1984). 'Mythic and non-mythic artists in Ovid's Metamorphoses', *Ramus* 13: 1-30.

Leach, Eleanor Winsor (1974). 'Ekphrasis and the theme of artistic failure in Ovid's Metamorphoses', *Ramus* 3: 102-142.

Lebek, Wolfgang Dieter (1976). *Lucans Pharsalia. Dichtungsstruktur und Zeitbezug.* Göttingen.

Leigh, Matthew (1997). *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement.* Oxford.

Leigh, Matthew (2000). 'Lucan and the Libyan Tale', *JRS* 90: 95-109.

Leigh, Matthew (2004), 'Quintilian on the Emotions (Institutio Oratoria 6 Preface and 1-2)', *JRS* 94: 122-140.

Lejay, Paul (ed.) (1894). *Lucanus De bello civili, liber 1.* Paris.

Lintott, Andrew (1971), 'Lucan and the History of the Civil War', *CQ* 21: 488-505.

Loraux, Nicole (1987). *Tragic ways of killing a woman,* trsl. by A. Foster. Cambridge, Mass.

Mack, Rainer (2002). 'Facing down Medusa: An aetiology of the gaze', *Art History* 25: 571-604.

Maes, Yanick (2005). 'Starting something Huge: Pharsalia I 183-193 and the Virgilian Intertext', in Walde 2005: 1-25.

Malamud, Martha (2003). 'Pompey's Head And Cato's Snakes', *CP* 98: 31-44.

Maltby, Robert (1991). *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies.* Leeds.

Manning, C. E. (1976). 'Seneca's 98th Letter and the praemeditatio futuri mali', *Mnemosyne* 29: 301-304.

Manzoni, Gian Enrico (2002). 'Giulia tra Cesare e Pompeo: il lessico del cuore', *Humanitas* 57.1: 29-38.

Marincola, John (2007). 'Speeches in Classical Historiography', in id. (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography.* Oxford and Maldon, Mass. 118-132.

Marti, Berthe M. (1945). 'The Meaning of the Pharsalia', *AJPh* 66: 352-376.

Marti, Berthe M. (1966). 'Cassius Scaeva and Lucan's Inventio', in L. Wallach (ed.), *The Classical Tradition. Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan.* Ithaca, NY. 239-257.

Marti, Berthe M. (1975). 'Lucan's Narrative Techniques', *PP* 30: 74-90.

Martindale, Charles A. (1976). 'Paradox, Hyperbole and Literary Novelty in Lucan's De Bello Civili', *BICS* 23: 45-54.

Martindale, Charles A. (1981). 'Lucan's Hercules: Padding or paradigm? A note on De Bello Civili 4.589-660', *SO* 56: 71-80.

Martindale, Charles A. (1984). 'The Politician Lucan', *G&R* 31: 64-79.

Masters, Jamie (1992). *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile.* Cambridge.

Mazzio, Carla (1997). 'Sins of the Tongue' in David Hillman and ead. (ed.), *The Body in Parts. Fantasies of Corporeality in Early Modern Europe.* London. 53-80.

Mazzoli, Giancarlo (2002). 'Giocasta in prima linea', in Antonio Aloni et al. (ed.) *I Sette a Tebe. Dal mito alla letteratura, Atti del Seminario Internazionale Torino 21-22 febbraio 2001.* Bologna. 155-168.

Mencacci, Francesca (1986). 'Sanguis/cruor. Designazioni linguistiche e classificazione antropologica del sangue nella cultura romana', *MD* 17: 25-91.

Menz, Walter (1970). 'Caesar und Pompeius im Epos Lucans' in Werner Rutz (ed.), *Lucan.* Darmstadt. 257-263.

Metger, Wilhelm (1970). 'Kampf und Tod in Lucans Pharsalia', Diss. Kiel 1957, Auszug (p. 48-63) in Werner Rutz (ed.), *Lucan.* Darmstadt. 423-438.

Mommsen, Theodor (1887). *Römisches Staatsrecht.* Leipzig.

Morford, Mark P.O. (1967). *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic.* Oxford.

Morford, Mark P.O. (1967). 'The Purpose of Lucan's Ninth Book', *Latomus* 26: 123-29.

Morwood, James (2000). *Euripides: Hecuba, Trojan Women, Andromache.* Trans. with explan. notes by J. M., with introd. and select bibl. by Edith Hall. Oxford.

Most, Glenn W. (1992). 'Disiecti membra poetae: The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry', in Ralph Hexter and Daniel Selden (ed.), *Innovations of Antiquity.* New York etc. 391-419.

Most, Glenn W. (2003). 'Memoria e obblio nell'Eneide', in Mario Citroni (ed.), *Memoria e identità: La cultura romana costruisce la sua imagine.* Firenze. 185-212.

Nagle, Betty Rose (1988). 'Ovid's "reticent" heroes.' *Helios* 15: 23-39.

Narducci, Emanuele (1973). 'Il tronco di Pompeo (Troia e Roma nella Pharsalia)', *Maia* 25: 317-325.

Narducci, Emanuele (1979). *La provvidenza crudele: Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei.* Pisa.

Narducci, Emanuele (1985). 'Ideologia e tecnica allusiva nella Pharsalia', in *ANRW* II 32.3. Berlin/New York. 1538-1564.

Narducci, Emanuele (1999). 'Deconstructing Lucan ovvero le nozze (coi fichi secchi) di Ermete Trismegisto e di Filologia', in Paolo Esposito e Luciano Nicastri (ed.), *Interpretare Lucano.* Miscellanea di Studi. Napoli. 39-83.

Narducci. Emanuele (2000). 'L'uccisione di Scevola il Pontefice in Cicerone e in Lucano', *Paideia* 55: 253-260.

Narducci, Emanuele (2001). 'Catone in Lucano (e alcune interpretazioni recenti)', *Athenaeum* 89: 171-86.

Narducci, Emanuele (2002). *Lucano: Un'epica contro l'impero.* Firenze.

Néraudau, Jean-Pierre (1985). 'Néron et le nouveau chant de Troie', *ANRW* II 32.3. Berlin/NewYork 2032-2045.

Newman, Robert J. (1989). 'Cotidie meditare. Theory and Practice of the meditatio in Imperial Stoicism'. *ANRW* II 36.3. Berlin/New York. 1473-1517.

Oakley, Stephen P. (1998). *A commentary on Livy. Books VI-X. 2, Books VII-VIII.* Oxford.

O'Higgins, Dolores (1988). 'Lucan as Vates', *ClAnt* 7: 208-26.

Ollfors, Anders (1967). *Studien zum Aufbau des Hexameters Lucans.* Göteborg.

Otis, Brooks (1970). *Ovid as an epic poet.* Cambridge.

Pallantza, Elena (2005). *Der Troische Krieg in der nachhomerischen Literatur bis zum 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Stuttgart.

Panoussi, Vassiliki (2009). *Greek Tragedy in Vergil's Aeneid: Ritual, Empire, and Intertext.* Cambridge.

Paoletti, Orazio (1988). 'Gorgones Romanae', *LIMC* 4.1. 345-362.

Papaioannou, Sophia (2005). 'Epic Transformation in the Second Degree: The Decapitation of Medusa in Lucan, *BC* 9.619-889', in Walde 2005: 216-236.

Papaioannou, Sophia (2007). *Redesigning Achilles: 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad' (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1-13.622).* Berlin/New York.

Paul, George M. (1982). 'Urbs Capta: Sketch of an Ancient Literary Motif', *Phoenix* 36: 144-155.

Pavlock, Barbara (1991). 'The tyrant and boundary violation in Ovid's Tereus episode', *Helios* 18: 34-48.

Pelling, Christopher (2002). 'Speech and Action: Herodotus' Debate on the Constitutions', *PCPhS* 48: 123-158.

Petrone, Gianna (1996). *Metafora e tragedia: Immagini culturali e modelli tragici nel mondo romano.* Palermo.

Pfeiffer, Rudolf (ed.) (1949). *Callimachus. Vol. I fragmenta.* Oxford.

Phillips, Oliver C. (1968). 'Lucan's Grove', *CPh* 63: 296-300.

Pitcher, Luke V. (2008). 'A Perfect Storm? Caesar and his Audiences at Lucan 5.504-702', *CQ* N.S. 58: 243-249.

Postgate, John Percival (1913). *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Ciuili Liber VII.* revised edn. Cambridge.

Putnam, Michael C.J. (1995). *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence.* Chapel Hill; London.

Putnam, Michael C.J. (1998). *Virgil's Epic Designs. Ekphrasis in the Aeneid.* New Haven (Conn.).

Putnam, Michael C.J. (2007). 'Troy in Latin Literature', *NECJ* 34.3: 195-205.

Quint, David (1993). *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton.* Princeton.

Radicke, Jan (2004). *Lucans poetische Technik: Studien zum historischen Epos.* Leiden/Boston.

Ramsey, John T. (2003). *Cicero: Philippics I-II.* Cambridge.

Raschle, Christian R. (2001). *Pestes Harenae: Die Schlangenepisode in Lucans Pharsalia (IX 587-949). Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar.* Frankfurt am Main.

Regenbogen, O. (1930). *Schmerz und Tod in den Tragödien Senecas,* Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg VII. Leipzig. 167-218.

Reitz, Christiane (1999). 'Zur Funktion der Kataloge in Ovids Metamorphosen', in Schubert, W. (ed.), *Ovid – Werk und Wirkung, Festgabe für Michael von Albrecht,* I. Frankfurt am Main. 359-372.

Reitz, Christiane (2006). *Die Literatur im Zeitalter Neros.* Darmstadt.

Richlin, Amy (1992). 'Reading Ovid's Rapes', in ead., *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome.* Oxford. 158-179.

Richlin, Amy (1999), 'Cicero's Head', in James I. Porter (ed.), *Constructions of the Classical Body.* Ann Arbor, Mich. 190-211.

Rimell, Victoria (2006). *Ovid's Lovers: Desire, Difference, and the Poetic Imagination.* Cambridge.

Rolim de Moura, Alessandro (2008). *Speech, Voice, and Dialogue in Lucan's Civil War.* Diss. Oxford.

Roller, Matthew (1993). *Constructing Autocracy.* Princeton.

Romilly, Jacqueline de (1956). *Histoire et raison chez Thucydide.* Paris.

Rosati, Gianpiero (1983). *Narciso e Pigmalione, Illusione e spettacolo nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio.* Firenze.

Ross, David O. (1998). 'Images of Fallen Troy in the Aeneid', in Peter Knox and Clive Foss (ed.), *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen.* Stuttgart / Leipzig. 121-129.

Rossi, Andreola (2000). 'The Aeneid Revisited: The Journey of Pompey in Lucan's Pharsalia', *AJPh* 121: 571-591.

Rossi, Andreola (2002). 'The Fall of Troy: Between Tradition and Genre', in David S. Levene and Damien P. Nelis (ed.), *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography.* Leiden / Bosten, Mass. 231-251.

Rossi, Andreola (2004). *Contexts of War: Manipulation of Genre in Virgilian Battle Narrative.* Ann Arbor.

Rotondi, Giovanni (1962). *Leges publicae populi Romani.* Hildesheim.

Rudich, Vasaly (1997). *Dissidence and Literature Under Nero: The Price of Rhetoricization.* London and New York.

Rusten, Jeffrey S. (1989). *Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War, Book II.* Cambridge.

Rutz, Werner (1960). 'Amor Mortis bei Lucan', *Hermes* 88: 462-475.

Rutz, Werner (1963). 'Die Träume des Pompeius in Lucans Pharsalia', *Hermes* 91: 334-345 (auch in Rutz 1970: 509-524).

Rutz, Werner (1965). 'Lucan und die Rhetorik', in Durry, M. (ed.), *Lucain, Sept exposés suivis de discussions (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique XV).* Vandœuvres-Genève. 233-257.

Rutz, Werner (ed.) (1970). *Lucan.* Darmstadt.

Rutz, Werner (1984). 'Lucan 1964-1983', *Lustrum* 26: 105-203.

Rutz, Werner (1989). *Studien zur Kompositionskunst und zur epischen Technik Lucans.* Hg. u. mit e. bibl. Nachw. vers. v. Andreas W. Schmitt. Frankfurt am Main.

Salemme, Carmelo (1999). 'Mundi ruina e funus nel II libro della Pharsalia', in Esposito e Nicastri 1999: 157-166.

Sannicandro, Lisa (2007). 'Per uno studio sulle donne della Pharsalia: Marcia Catonis', *MH* 64: 83-99.

Saylor, Charles (1978). 'Belli spes inproba: The Theme of Walls in Lucan, Pharsalia VI', *TAPA* 108: 243 257.

Saylor, Charles (1982). 'Curio and Antaeus: The African Episode of Lucan Pharsalia IV', *TAPA* 112: 169-177.

Saylor, Charles (2002). 'Vana species leti: Cato's March in Lucan, *Pharsalia* IX', in Pol Defosse (ed.), *Hommages à Carl Deroux: 1 - Poésie*. Bruxelles. 458-463.

Schlonski, Frank (1995). *Studien zum Erzählerstandort bei Lucan*. Trier.

Schmitt, Andreas W. (1995). *Die direkten Reden der Massen in Lucans Pharsalia*. Frankfurt am Main etc.

Schmitz, Christine (2007). '„Umwertung aller Werte" in Lucans Pharsalia'. *Gymnasium* 114: 233-249.

Schmitz, Christine (2009). 'Lucanus', in *RAC* 23. 549-570.

Schnepf, Hermann (1970). 'Untersuchungen zur Darstellungskunst Lucans im 8. Buch der Pharsalia', in Rutz 1970: 380-406.

Schönberger, Otto (1961). *Untersuchungen zur Wiederholungstechnik Lucans*. Diss. Heidelberg.

Schotes, Hans-Albert (1969). *Stoische Physik, Psychologie und Theologie bei Lucan*. Bonn.

Schrijvers, Petrus H. (1988). 'Deuil, désespoir, destruction (Lucain, La Pharsale II 1-234)', *Mnemosyne* 41: 341-354.

Schrijvers, Petrus H. (1989). 'Interpréter Lucain par Lucain. La Pharsale I, 1-8, II, 234-325', *Mnemosyne* 42: 62-75.

Schrijvers, Petrus H. (1990). *Crise poétique et poésie de crise. La réception de Lucain aux XIXe et XXe siècles, suivi d'une interprétation de la scène "César à Troie"* (la Pharsale 9,950-999). Amsterdam.

Schubert, Christoph (1998). *Studien zum Nerobild in der lateinischen Dichtung der Antike*. Stuttgart/Leipzig.

Seewald, Martin (2008). *Studien zum 9. Buch von Lucans Bellum civile. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1.733*. Berlin/New York.

Segal, Charles 'Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid and Euripides', *TAPA* 114: 311-325.

Segal, Charles (1989). *Orpheus: the myth of the poet.* Baltimore.

Segal, Charles (1990). *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety.* Princeton.

Segal, Charles (1994). 'Philomela's web and the pleasures of the text: reader and violence in the Metamorphoses of Ovid', in de Jong, I.J.F and Sullivan, J.P. (ed.), *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature.* Leiden etc. 257-280.

Segal, Charles (1998). 'Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender and Violence in the Metamorphoses', *Arion* 5: 9-41.

Segal, Charles (2001). 'Intertextuality and Immortality: Ovid, Pythagoras and Lucretius in Metamorphoses 15', *MD* 46: 63-101.

Seidensticker, Bernd und Vöhler, Martin (ed.) (2006). *Gewalt und Ästhetik: Zur Gewalt und ihrer Darstellung in der griechischen Klassik.* Berlin/New York.

Seitz, Konrad (1965). 'Der pathetische Erzählstil Lucans', *Hermes* 93: 204-32.

Selinger, Reinhard (1999). 'Experimente mit dem Skalpell am menschlichen Körper in der griechisch-römischen Antike', *Saeculum. Jahrbuch für Universalgeschichte* 50: 29-47.

Selinger, Reinhard (2001). 'Das Recht im Bild: Die Forumsszenen der praedia Iuliae Felicis in Pompeji', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 118: 344-364.

Seng, Helmut (2003). 'Troja-Motive bei Lucan', *Gymnasium* 110: 121-145.

Siebers, Tobin (1983). *The Mirror of Medusa.* California.

Shackleton Bailey, David R. (ed.) (1988). *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X.* Stuttgart.

Shackleton Bailey, David R. (ed.) (1997). *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X. Editio altera.* Stuttgart/Leipzig.

Shoaf, Robert A. (1978). 'Certius exemplar sapientis viri: Rhetorical Subversion and Subversive Rhetoric in Pharsalia 9', *PhQ* 67: 143-154.

Sistakou, Evina (2008). *Reconstructing the Epic: Cross-Readings of the Trojan Myth in Hellenistic Poetry.* Leuven etc.

Sklenář, Robert (1999). 'Nihilistic Cosmology and Catonian Ethics in Lucan's Bellum Civile', *AJPh* 120: 281-296.

Sklenář, Robert (2003). *The Taste For Nothingness: A Study of Virtus and Related Themes in Lucan's Bellum Civile.* Ann Arbor.

Skutsch, Otto (ed.) (1985). *The Annals of Q. Ennius.* Oxford.

Solodow, Joseph B. (1988). *The World of Ovid's Metamorphoses.* Chapel Hill and London.

Spivey, Nigel Jonathan (2001). *Enduring Creation: Art, Pain, and Fortitude.* London.

Strasburger, Gisela (1954). *Die kleinen Kämpfer der Ilias.* Frankfurt.

Sullivan, John Patrick (1987). *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero.* Ithaca/London.

Syndikus, Hans Peter (1958). *Lucans Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg: Untersuchungen zur epischen Technik und zu den Grundlagen des Werkes.* Diss. München.

Tandoi, Vincenzo (1964). 'Albinovano Pedone e la retorica giulio-claudia delle conquiste', *SIFC* 36: 129-168.

Tasler, Wolfgang (1972). *Die Reden in Lucans Pharsalia.* Bonn.

Thierfelder, Andreas (1934). 'Der Dichter Lucan', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 25,1: 1-20. Wieder abgedr. in u. zit. nach Rutz 1970: 50-69.

Thomas, Richard F. (1982).*Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition.* PCPhS Suppl. 7. Cambridge.

Thompson, Lynette (1964). 'Lucan's Apotheosis of Nero', *CP* 59: 147-153.

Thomson, Douglas F.S. (1997). *Catullus. Edited with a Textual and Interpretative Commentary.* Toronto.

Todorov, Tzvetan (1972). *Einführung in die fantastische Literatur.* München (frz. Paris 1970).

Usener, Hermann (ed.) (1869). *Commenta Bernensia.* Leipzig.

Valk, Marchinus van der (ed.) (1979). *Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem Pertinentes.* Leiden.

Vasaly, Ann (1993). *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory.* Berkeley / London.

Vernant, Jean-Pierre (1991). 'A "Beautiful Death" and the disfigured corpse in Homeric Epic', in id., *Mortals and Immortals. Collected Essays.* Ed. by Froma Zeitlin. Princeton. 50-74.

Viansino, Giovanni (1974). *Studi sul Bellum Civile di Lucano.* Salerno.

Viarre, Simone (1982). 'Caton en Libye: L'histoire et la métaphore (Lucain, Pharsale, 9.292-949)', in Jean-Michel Croisille & P.-M. Fauchère (ed.), *Neronia 1977. Actes du 2e Colloque de la Société internationale des études néroniennes (Clermont-Ferrand, 27-28 mai 1977).* Clermont-Ferrand. 103-110.

Vögler, Gudrun (1968), 'Das neunte Buch innerhalb der Pharsalia des Lucan und die Frage der Vollendung des Epos', *Philologus* 112: 222-268.

Vološinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, trans. by Matejka and I. Ladislav R. Titunik.* New York and London.

Walde, Christine (2001). *Die Traumdarstellungen in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung.* München / Leipzig.

Walde, Christine (2004). 'Nach der Katastrophe: Zum Verhältnis von Erinnerung und Innovation in Vergils Aeneis', in Achatz von Müller und Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg (ed.), *Die Wahrnehmung des Neuen in Antike und Renaissance. Colloquium Rauricum 8.* München / Leipzig. 41-66.

Walde, Christine (Hg.) (2005). *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert – Lucan in the 21st Century – Lucano nei primi del XXI secolo.* Leipzig.

Walde, Christine (forthcoming). 'Feasting After Pharsalus.'

Walker, Andrew D. (1996). 'Lucan's Legends of the Fall', *Ramus* 25.1: 65-87.

Walsh, Patrick G. (1973). *Livy, Book XXI.* Bristol.

Wheeler, Stephen Michael (1999). *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses.* Philadelphia.

White, Horace (tr.) (1913). *Appian's Roman History, Vol III.* Cambridge MA / London.

Wick, Claudia (2004). *M. Annaeus Lucanus: Bellum Civile, Liber IX. Bd. 1: Text u. Übers. Bd. 2: Komm.* München.

Wiener, Claudia (2006). *Stoische Doktrin in römischer Belletristik. Das Problem von Entscheidungsfreiheit und Determinismus in Senecas Tragödien und Lucans Pharsalia.* München / Leipzig.

Wiener, Claudia (2008), 'Die therapeutische Konzeption von Senecas Consolationes', in Ulrich Schlegelmilch und Tanja Tanner (ed.), *Die Dichter und die Sterne. Beiträge zur lateinischen und griechischen Literatur für Ludwig Braun.* WJA N.F. Beiheft 2. 67-99.

Wildberger, Jula (2005), 'Quanta sub nocte iaceret nostra dies (Lucan. 9,13f.) – Stoizismen als Mittel der Verfremdung bei Lucan', in Walde 2005: 56-88.

Wilk, Stephen R. (2000). *Medusa: Solving the Mystery of the Gorgon.* New York.

Williams, Gordon (1978). *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire.* Berkeley.

Wills, Jeffrey (1996). *Repetition in Latin Poetry.* Oxford.

Wirszubski, Chaim (1950). *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome During the Late Republic and Early Principate.* Cambridge.

Wuilleumier, Pierre and Le Bonniec, Henri (ed.) (1962). *M. Annaeus Lucanus, Bellum Ciuile, Liber Primus.* Paris.

Zeitlin, Froma I. (2009). 'Troy and Tragedy: The Conscience of Hellas', in Christine Walde and Ueli Dill (ed.), *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen.* Berlin / New York. 678-695.

Zwierlein, Otto (ed.) (1986). *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae.* Oxford.

Zwierlein, Otto (1970). 'Das Waltharius-Epos und seine lateinischen Vorbilder', *A&A* 16: 153-184.

Index locorum

A

Acta Apostolorum
16.22-38 189

Aeneas Tacticus
38.5 79

Albinovanus Pedo
carm.
frg. 1-23 (Courtney) 116f.

Apollonios Rhodios
4.1237-1249 111
4.1513-1517 142

Appianos
B.C.
2.33-38 57
2.42 63
2.42-44 63
2.43 63
2.44 63
2.47 64
2.60 93
2.66.275 76
2.67.277 76
2.67.287 76
2.72-74 78
2.72.299-300 77
2.72.300 83
2.72.301 ..... 79, 82
2.73.303 82
2.73.305f. 87
2.74.307 77
2.74.308f. 83
2.74.309 87
2.74.310 88
2.75.314 83

Apuleius
met.
2.8 180

Aristophanes
V.
560-575 83
975-978 83

Aristoteles
fr. 549 Rose 187
Rh.
1402a18-28 75

Arrianos
3.29 114
6.24-26 114

Athenaios
13.576a 187

C

Caesar
civ.
1.64.2 56
1.72.2-3 56
1.73-86 63
1.74 63
3.5 68
3.53.3-5 93
3.85.4 78
3.86f. 74, 78
3.85.4 82
3.87.5-7 88
3.90 78
3.90.1 ..... 73, 87
3.91.2 80
3.91.2-3 78

3.92.4-5 77
Gall.
1.41.3 56
7.17.8 56
Carmina Einsidlensia
1.38-41 20
Cassius Dio
41.56 79
41.57 ..... 78f.
62.18.1 20
Catullus
11.1-8 61
64.154-157 120
64.155-157 120
64.357-360 28
64.362-371 28
64.397-408 28
66.42 185
Cicero
Balb.
51 87
Brut.
12 10
223 186
de orat.
1.227f. 83
2.30 75
div.
68-69 74
fam.
7.1 76
7.1.2 76
7.3.2 75
9.18.2 74
Lael.
99 6
Mur.
1.51 138
off.
1.107 53
1.108-110 53
1.115 53
1.116-117 53
1.122-125 53
orat.
59 186
Phil.
13.1 86
Curtius Rufus
7.5.1-6 114

D

Diodorus Siculus
17.49ff. 114
20.42.1f. 114

E

Ennius
ann.
233 Skutsch/
254 Warmington 88
234-235 Skutsch/276-
277 Warmington 87
483-484 Skutsch 178
485-486 Skutsch 178
scaen.
370 V.^{2} 48
Euripides
Andr.
8-11 32
399f. 32
Hec.
231-233 35
260-263 25
488-491 32
Tr.
265-267 25
466-510 36
469-471 32
479-484 32
628 25
764f. 24
884-888 32
1159f. 24
1240-1245 32

1288-1290 32
Eustathius
III.818 177

F
Florus
epit.
2.13.13 41
2.13.32-33 66
2.13.50 70
Fronto
p. 155 van den Hout ... 159

H
Herodotos
3.26.3 113
4.173 113
6.114 187
Homeros
Il.
4.122-126 107
6.269-312 31
6.448f. 22
9.112-157 90
9.115-161 89
9.264-299 90
9.392 89
10.239 90
10.457 ..... 177f.
14.195f. 7
18.426f. 7
21.26-32 26
21.218-220 28
21.235-238 28
22.59-71 19
23.175f. 26
24.729-738 19
Od.
5.89f. 7
22.329 177
Horatius
carm.
1.22.5-8 61
sat.
2.8.95 121

I
Isidorus
orig.
7.7 71
Iustinus
43.3.4-13 187
Iuvenalis
1.155-57 13
4.69-71 5

K
Kallimachos
frg. 110 Pfeiffer 185

L
Lactantius
inst.
1.11.25 71
Livius
1.13.1-4 45
1.13.2 46
1.13.3 ..... 46, 48
1.13.4 46
1.13.4ff. 44
1.13.8 46
1.16.7 138
1.55 138
2.32.8-12 138
2.32.8ff. 188
2.40.3-5 44
4.37.7 88
5.19.8 88
7.12.10-7.14.5 77
8.8.19-11.1 77
8.29.5 88
21.30.10-11 138
21.40-44 73
21.43.3-5 88
28.12.2-5 83
30.30.3-30.31.9 73

30.33.8-12 83
34.13.5 82
Liv. perioch.
111 ..... 74f.
Lucani commenta Bernensia
ad
1.1 71
7.62 74
7.127 78
Lucanus
[Iliaca]
fr. 5-6a Blänsdorf/
5-6 Courtney 20
[de incendio urbis] 3
1.1 ..... 21, 91
1.4 46
1.8 77
1.66 21
1.67f. 88
1.84-86 46
1.87 46
1.98 46
1.99f. 189
1.107f. 189
1.111-112 42
1.111-120 ..... 40ff.
1.116 ..... 42, 46
1.117 42
1.118 ..... 42f.
1.119 46
1.126 68
1.126f. 87
1.128 ..... 10, 141, 171
1.151-157 140
1.164-165 124
1.182 161
1.183-185 133
1.183-212 40
1.186 168
1.190-192 168
1.200 56
1.203 69
1.205-212 ..... 120, 126f.
1.226 79
1.227 ..... 79, 87
1.255 133
1.260 79
1.266 57
1.273-291 106
1.283-287 58
1.291f. 62
1.299-351 81
1.311-312 61
1.311-326 60
1.315 ..... 60f.
1.319-323 60
1.323 60
1.327-329 60
1.327-331 120
1.327-332 64
1.330-331 ..... 60, 120
1.331 120
1.333-335 61
1.335 60
1.336 61
1.343-345 55
1.346 60
1.348f. 61
1.352-353 60
1.352-356 169
1.353 81
1.358 61
1.359-360 70
1.359-386 106
1.359-391 81
1.365-366 55
1.372 62
1.373-374 62
1.386 62
1.386-388 169
1.386-391 81
1.392 62
1.498-502 121
1.522 49

1.549-552 47
1.667-668 152
1.668f. 91
1.670 ..... 10, 79
1.673-695 40
1.685 35
2.1-15 32
2.2f. xi
2.16-64 17
2.21-28 31
2.28-42 40
2.36f. 32
2.38-42 32
2.64 31
2.64-66 37
2.67 29
2.67-233 17
2.68-93 32
2.69 133
2.86 32
2.93 133
2.98-100 24
2.98-104 23
2.104-109 24
2.108 24
2.111 35
2.116 24
2.118-124 24
2.119-129 25
2.121-124 35
2.124 137
2.126-128 24
2.126-129 ..... x, 18, 33f.
2.134-138 24
2.136 138
2.148-151 28
2.150f. 35
2.151 34
2.157ff. 186
2.160-173 35
2.162-165 24
2.166-167 137
2.169-173 34
2.171-173 137
2.173-176 25
2.173-193 ..... 25, 31, 99
2.173f. 24
2.177-193 27
2.181-184 177
2.181ff. 185
2.183f. 99
2.186f. 99
2.189 35
2.190-191 137
2.190f. 24
2.191 99
2.207f. 31
2.209-220 28
2.221f. 24
2.223-226 36
2.232 31
2.232f. 36
2.262 67
2.286-323 141
2.288 153
2.295-297 123
2.301-303 141
2.304 54
2.307-315 67
2.315-316 141
2.320-322 76
2.323-325 171
2.326-380 39
2.374-378 124
2.388 136
2.410 ix
2.410-417 120
2.480 60
2.483ff. x
2.494ff. x
2.512-515 54
2.526-609 49
2.529-595 84
2.531 x

2.531-595 55
2.535 60
2.536 ..... 60, 64
2.537-539 86
2.544 ..... 60, 64
2.544-559 60
2.552-553 51
2.555 84
2.575 60
2.583-595 84
2.596 60
2.596-600 84
2.610ff. ix
2.655 138
2.725 ix
2.725-736 49
2.727-728 49
2.736 ix
3.8-35 ..... xi, 50f.
3.8-40 ..... 40, 49
3.30-34 49
3.36 xi
3.68-70 120
3.91 56
3.99 56
3.134-140 54
3.152 79
3.169ff. viii
3.289f. 83
3.292-295 119
3.361-365 62
3.399-425 ..... ix, 131
3.402-404 131
3.412-417 ..... 131f.
3.416 132
3.419 132
3.437 ..... 65, 132
3.448-449 132
3.500 x
3.510f. x
3.567-751 102
3.569f. x
3.605 187
3.608 187
3.620 188
3.622 188
3.681 x
3.758f. x
3.760-761 137
4.2-4 63
4.48 112
4.128f. 113
4.169-171 171
4.169-204 63
4.196 63
4.205 63
4.209 64
4.218 63
4.222-227 63
4.229 55
4.235f. 172
4.238-241 64
4.245-246 64
4.258f. 64
4.269-273 65
4.338-341 84
4.340-341 64
4.344-362 55
4.346-347 64
4.363-364 55
4.384-401 64
4.402-581 100
4.448 65
4.480 66
4.488 67
4.491 67
4.496-499 67
4.500-501 67
4.512 67
4.529-538 66
4.540 55
4.540-547 67
4.549-556 67
4.557-558 67

4.558 67
4.561 184
4.574 67
4.579 67
4.581-660 135
4.581f. 120
4.589 130
4.590 129
4.590-591 129
4.592 129
4.601-602 130
4.602 130
4.605-606 130
4.610 129
4.612-613 129
4.629f. 113
4.643f. 114
4.654-655 129
4.659 130
4.684-686 130
4.734-737 119
4.784 143
4.799-802 58
4.799-824 58
4.819-820 58
4.824 ..... 58, 136
5.36-37 138
5.120-236 40
5.252 188
5.310 188
5.340-343 65
5.343 9
5.386 79
5.468-475 ..... 40, 42f.
5.473 43
5.474 43
5.476-677 65
5.481f. 65
5.484-485 121
5.488 65
5.581f. 65
5.592f. 65
5.653f. 65
5.682-699 65
5.722-815 40
6.61-63 103
6.63 91
6.80-105 103
6.118-260 92
6.138-148 94
6.138-262 91
6.138ff. xi
6.139 92
6.144-148 91
6.145-146 55
6.147f. 91
6.148f. 97
6.149-165 94
6.150-165 68
6.153 99
6.153f. 99
6.155 97
6.159 68
6.162f. 68
6.165 ..... 95, 97
6.165-169 94
6.168f. 97
6.169-188 ..... 94, 102
6.170 99
6.180-183 ..... 94, 102
6.180f. 102
6.189-213 94
6.194 99
6.196-201 94
6.201 99
6.205 95
6.208-213 ..... 68, 94
6.210-211 120
6.214-227 94
6.217-219 99
6.220-223 ..... 68, 94, 120
6.224-226 99
6.228-246 94
6.229 ..... 95, 97

6.230-235 95
6.230-246 68
6.234f. 95
6.236-239 95
6.240 97
6.247-257 94
6.254 97
6.257-262 94
6.262 ..... 79, 98
6.299-313 86
6.357-359 137
6.461-465 149
6.507-830 40
6.523-525 149
6.679 121
6.724f. 101
6.788-789 132
6.807 101
6.816-817 133
7.45-57 74
7.52 75
7.53 75
7.55 76
7.56f. 75
7.57 77
7.58-61 74
7.58f. 77
7.60 78
7.62-65 74
7.67 75
7.68-85 ..... 55, 74f.
7.71 75
7.72f. 76
7.73 75
7.75 75
7.76 75
7.81 75
7.85f. 81
7.87f. 77
7.91 55
7.95 77
7.98f. 76
7.99-101 77
7.110 55
7.110f. 77
7.113 55
7.123 87
7.123-127 78
7.149 138
7.151-184 105
7.195f. 23
7.203-213 88
7.211 88
7.222-223 132
7.244 81
7.250 ..... 61, 68, 70, 80f.
7.250-329 79
7.251f. 82
7.256 87
7.259-260 79
7.259-263 87
7.263 ..... 79, 87
7.263-265 69
7.270-274 83
7.272-284 69
7.272f. 83
7.273f. 83
7.281-284 83
7.295 69
7.296f. 77
7.297-298 81
7.297-302 69
7.297f. 87
7.299-300 80
7.304-307 87
7.307 81
7.307f. 69
7.311-319 87
7.314f. 69
7.318f. 69, 87
7.319 62
7.320-325 87
7.321 139
7.326-328 88

7.329 88
7.329-336 88
7.339-341 84
7.342-382 82
7.343 84
7.346-348 87
7.352-355 87
7.354-356 80
7.367f. 83
7.373 80
7.376-380 ..... 84f.
7.379 80
7.382 80
7.382-384 84
7.465 139
7.470-474 107
7.471-473 56
7.501-503 69
7.533 184
7.557 ..... 70, 127
7.567-570 ..... 70, 127
7.570 138
7.575 139
7.586-596 70
7.599-616 70
7.606-607 55
7.621 139
7.626-628 137
7.628-630 137
7.630-646 81
7.640 9
7.642-645 84
7.645f. 80
7.647-649 81
7.659-666 81
7.680-691 85
7.695-696 150
7.695f. 10
7.728 70
7.766 70
8.40-158 40
8.90-94 52
8.161-327 55
8.269-271 133
8.553 61
8.577-662 40
8.615-617 147
8.619-620 147
8.621 147
8.623-624 147
8.682f. 189
8.698 35
8.698-699 140
8.793 190
8.798f. 190
8.869-872 127
9.14 190
9.15-116 40
9.42-44 133
9.123-125 ..... 138, 189
9.167-179 40
9.193 54
9.204-206 141
9.205 54
9.213-214 138
9.265 54
9.303-318 ..... 111, 120
9.348 125
9.348-367 136
9.351 125
9.356 125
9.359 129
9.359-360 126
9.390-392 145
9.402 114
9.408-410 112
9.411-412 133
9.411-413 110
9.411-471 120
9.424 110
9.431-434 114
9.436 128
9.438 114
9.462 113

9.467-471 113
9.485-489 112
9.493 113
9.495-497 113
9.503 128
9.577 113
9.607-608 129
9.616 127
9.619 127
9.619-621 114
9.619-623 122
9.619-699 ..... 127, 135
9.619ff. 185
9.620 140
9.621-622 128
9.621-623 142
9.622 129
9.626 ..... 128f.
9.627 140
9.629 ..... 123, 129
9.632 140
9.633 124
9.636-637 ..... 128, 146
9.637-639 128
9.637-640 124
9.640-641 146
9.644 129
9.648 124
9.649 146
9.650 129
9.653-654 124
9.655-658 149
9.659 129
9.662 185
9.670 147
9.672 140
9.672-674 124
9.676 139
9.679 139
9.681 147
9.681-683 124
9.684 123
9.696-700 142
9.700-701 139
9.700ff. 114
9.715 130
9.719 139
9.726 140
9.738 139
9.755 140
9.756 116
9.759-760 148
9.760 140
9.761-762 148
9.767-769 ..... 109, 148
9.779 148
9.781 ..... 139f.
9.794 141
9.800-801 140
9.805 143
9.814 109
9.823-824 140
9.828-833 140
9.830-833 146
9.832 146
9.832f. 177
9.839-840 131
9.848-880 115
9.849 139
9.850-851 139
9.857 114
9.873-874 130
9.877-878 131
9.881-889 ..... 144f.
9.886-887 145
9.939 130
9.942-943 130
9.942-945 113
9.946-947 130
9.964-969 108
9.986-999 133
9.1014 ..... 61, 70
9.1046-1051 ..... 40, 43
9.1048-1049 43

9.1064-1104 70
10.37-38 134
10.53-171 40
10.72-81 133
10.77-78 40
10.77-81 43
10.111-126 106
10.151-154 124
10.191-192 126
10.237-239 126
10.268-282 126
10.282-331 120
10.295 126
10.327-328 126
10.445-446 134
10.534-539 133
10.542-546 100
10.544-46 70
Lucretius
1.92-6 181
3.642-656 178
3.653 178

M
Manilius
1.161-166 113
Martialis
14.194 71

N
Nero
[Troica]
frg. 9-10 Blänsdorf/
7-8 Courtney 20

O
Onasandros
1.13-16 73
13.3 79
14.3-4 79
Ovidius
am.
1.1 183
1.15.25-26 138
3.10.17 124
ars
2.24 111
epist.
2.70 111
10.102 111
10.127 111
fast.
3.202 ..... 45f.
3.202ff. 44
3.203-228 ..... 45f.
3.210 46
3.211 46
3.218 47
met.
1.343-347 113
1.451 183
1.583-750 180
4.1-415 179
4.617-620 142
4.793-803 123
5.1-145 179
5.1-249 182
5.104-106 179
5.115ff. 179
5.140 187
5.177ff. 176
6.441-670 176
6.522ff. 181
6.550 180
6.557 179
6.557-560 ..... 27, 181
6.581 181
7.47 180
8.119-121 120
8.323 111
11.50ff. 179
12.39-63 181
12.99 109
12.268-270 99
12.390-392 99

13.267 109
13.409f. 33
13.494-532 36
13.515f. 26
15.434-435 138
15.879 181
trist.
2.535 184

P

Petronius
119-124 21
89 20
118 71
119 159
Photios
190.151a16-18 76
Platon
Ap.
34b-35b 83
Plinius
nat.
8.42 110
Plutarchos
Caes.
16 187
Cat. Mi.
55 74
Cic.
39.1 74
48-49 189
Crass.
31-33 189
Moralia
48F-49A 6
62E 7
Pomp.
46.1 76
48.8 41
53.3-5 41
Polybios
3.36f. 110
3.62-64 73
38.21-22 22
Propertius
4.7.93-94 50

Q

Quintilianus
inst.
2.8.23 66
3.8.23 66
3.8.30 66
6.1.47 83
9.2.55 5
9.2.67 ..... 5f.
9.2.68 8
9.2.69-70 7
9.2.72 7
10.1.9-20 2
10.1.30 11
10.1.65 2
10.1.86 13
10.1.90 ..... 2, 13, 71
10.1.96 12
10.1.104 12
10.1.125 14
11.3.65-136 186

S

Sallustius
hist.
1.44 186
Iug.
64.5 77
Seneca (maior)
contr.
2.2.12 111
2pr3 110
suas.
1 110
1.15 116
7.14 189
Seneca (minor)
Ag.
656-658 33

clem.
1.2.4 ... 152
1.3.4-5 ... 138
dial.
1.1 ... 156
1.2.9-10 ... 165
1.3 ... 156
4.4 ... 167
11.1 ... 160
epist.
11.8 ... 144
11.10 ... 145f.
14.13 ... 141
24.5 ... 146
25.5 ... 144
25.6 ... 145
78.21 ... 145
82.12-13 ... 54
85.29 ... 144, 146
91.1 ... 164
91.9 ... 164
95.71 ... 54
104.21-22 ... 145
nat.
4a.9 ... 7
6.8.3-4 ... 126
6.32 ... 164
Oed.
321-323 ... 47
965-969 ... 27
prov.
2.7-10 ... 166
2.12 ... 166
Tro.
28 ... 32
41-43 ... 37
44-50 ... 33
54-56 ... 34
255f. ... 26
298-300 ... 26
954 ... 32
1065-1179 ... 31
1104-1109 ... 24
1173f. ... 32
Servius
Aen.
1.159 ... 110
1.382 ... 71, 157
10.396 ... 178
Silius Italicus
9.209-211 ... 87
Statius
silv.
2.7.55 ... 20
2.7.60-61 ... 3
2.7.66 ... 3
Theb.
11.56 ... 178
Strabon
15.2.4-7 ... 114
Suetonius
Aug.
15 ... 27
Caes.
49-52 ... 124
45 ... 124
Dom.
2.2 ... 14
20 ... 14f.
Iul.
26 ... 41
68 ... 93, 187
Nero
38.2 ... 20

T

Tacitus
ann.
15.39.3 ... 20
15.49 ... 4
15.52.3 ... 152
dial.
1 ... 2
4 ... 2
17 ... 2

Thukydides
2.87 ... 73
2.89 ... 73
3.85.3 ... 88
6.68.2 ... 83
6.68.3-4 ... 88
Tibullus
3.4.84-94 ... 120

V
Valerius Maximus
3.2.22 ... 187
3.2.23 ... 93
4.6.4 ... 41
Varro
rust.
2.7.4 ... 86
Vegetius
mil.
3.9.11-13 ... 79
3.12.3-3.12.4 ... 79
Velleius Paterculus
2.47.2 ... 41
Vergilius
Aen.
1.479-482 ... 31
1.488 ... 35
2.3-13 ... 31
2.5f. ... 30
2.103 ... 182
2.324f. ... 23
2.338 ... 169
2.361 ... 31
2.364-366 ... 23
2.368 ... 23
2.486-490 ... 32
2.488 ... 169
2.499-502 ... 33, 35
2.533-558 ... x
2.534ff. ... 182
2.551 ... 24
2.557 ... 35, 140
2.559-563 ... 35
2.777-778 ... 49
2.783-784 ... 49
3.128 ... 169
4.11 ... 188
4.384-387 ... 50
4.665 ... 169
5.140 ... 169
6.33 ... 186
6.494-501 ... 27f.
6.494-547 ... 27
6.760-846 ... 12
6.773-76 ... 13
6.888ff. ... 171
8.185-275 ... 137
8.364 ... 129
8.368 ... 121
9.551-555 ... 94
9.722-761 ... 94
9.778-818 ... 94
9.801 ... 94
9.815f. ... 94
10.64 ... 124
10.284 ... 88
10.395f. ... 178, 182
10.396 ... 178
10.517-520 ... 26
10.691f. ... 94
11.81 ... 26
11.192 ... 169
11.641 ... 188
11.644 ... 188
11.745 ... 169
12.266-268 ... 107
georg.
1.498-9 ... 57
3.339 ... 61
4.523 ... 178